

# THE STANDARD

HENRY GEORGE, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

NO. 61-VOL. III, NO. 9.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 3, 1888.

PRICE FIVE CENTS

**A CALL FOR A CONFERENCE.**  
In our advertising columns will be found a notice asking advocates of the single tax who are in favor of holding a national conference to send their addresses to Samuel W. Williams of Vincennes, Indiana.

In the letter inclosing this advertisement, Mr. Williams says:

No matter whether we are to support Cleveland or Blaine, or a ticket of our own, we can certainly benefit ourselves and the cause of reform by holding a great national conference.

In the west we are taking steps to have a grand meeting on July 4. Bailey is to issue the call. It is not to be a convention. It is not a meeting of the united labor party or any other party, but is a meeting of all individuals who desire to come, and who believe that the public revenues should be raised by a single tax on relative land values. We have given ourselves ample time to do the necessary preliminary work, and there is no good reason that I can see why this meeting should not be a grand success.

The circular which Mr. Williams proposes to send to those who respond to his notice is as follows:

"The advocates of a great principle should know no thought of compromise. They should proclaim it in its fullness, and point to its complete attainment as their goal."

VINCENNES, Ind., Feb. 20, 1888.  
Dear Sir:—It is deemed expedient that a national conference of those who believe in the single tax idea should be held on the 4th day of July, 1888.

This shall be a conference and not a convention. It should not have power to nominate candidates. It will be a mass meeting of all those who desire to attend, who believe that the public revenues should be raised by a single and direct tax upon relative land values. The call will be limited to the advocates of this idea.

The meeting will be held in the west or south. It is suggested that one hundred or more of us join in a request to Warren Worth Bailey, of 281 South Hoyne avenue, Chicago, Ill., authorizing him to select the place, appoint a committee on arrangements and prepare and issue the call. The time has arrived when we should meet, clear heads, commit and organize. The Cincinnati conference (July 4, 1887) ordered a national conference. Please write to Mr. Bailey immediately on the subject and name to him your choice of place of meeting.

Truly yours, SAMUEL W. WILLIAMS.

Two or three of our friends who have already received copies of this circular send them to me, asking what I think of the proposition.

What I think is, that Mr. Williams has no more authority than anybody else to take preliminary steps for calling a national conference of single tax men; but that in the absence of anything like a national organization, he has just as much authority as anybody else. And there is something essentially democratic in this straightforward individual action that I like. Mr. Williams, it will be remembered, was the author of the resolution adopted at the little gathering of advocates of the single tax held in Cincinnati last Fourth of July, which requested John McMackin to call a national conference before October of last year. Seeing that Mr. McMackin has not acted, and that the Cincinnati resolution is likely to be made the pretext for a very different kind of a call than it originally contemplated, Mr. Williams now steps forward himself, and virtually suggests to those who believe in the single tax that they, by individual action, appoint Mr. Warren Worth Bailey, now of Chicago, a committee to select a place, make arrangements, and call a conference on the Fourth of July next. Mr. Bailey will, I think, make just as good a committee for that purpose as Mr. McMackin would have made, or as a larger one selected in any other way. He is a staunch and conscientious believer in the single tax, and has the honor of having published the first newspaper in the United States which unqualifiedly advocated it—the Vincennes News—from which he was finally compelled to retire by the loss of patronage consequent upon his open devotion to the single tax principle. He is active and reliable, and will, I am convinced, promptly and fairly discharge the duties which Mr. Williams suggests should be devolved upon him by the individual request of a hundred or more.

The date suggested for this conference, the Fourth of July, seems also to me to be a good one. By that time both the old parties will have adopted their platforms and made their nominations, and the popular issue in the presidential struggle will have been clearly made. If it should then appear expedient that single tax men should take any organized part in the national contest, there will be ample time to do so. If, on the contrary, it should then be clear that the time has not yet come for us to independently enter the field of national politics, a national conference will at least give such of us as can attend an opportunity of making one another's acquaintance, of comparing views, and of suggesting plans for future action. It also seems to me well that the call for this conference should emanate from the west and that the conference should be held at some point in the Mississippi valley that should be nearly as possible equalize the cost of attendance.

In short, I can see nothing to object to, and much to approve, in the proposed conference and in the manner of call which Mr. Williams advises, and I would suggest to those who favor the idea that they communicate with Mr. Williams as he asks.

HENRY GEORGE.

**THE BROTHERHOOD STRIKE.**  
Quick on the heels of the Reading strikes with all their large consequences and pregnant lessons, comes another strike which

promises to be still more important, and which, indeed, may prove to be the opening of the most momentous industrial war that has ever yet been waged in the United States—that of the brotherhood of locomotive engineers on the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy railroad system. It might seem as if, irritated and alarmed at the defeat of one powerful champion after another, the strongest and most conservative of the great trades unions had leaped into the arena, or, what is doubtless much nearer the truth, as if organized capital, flushed with recent victories, had challenged to a decisive struggle what from the nature of the occupation, and the vital relation it bears to other industries and social functions, is of all labor organizations that which can fight with the greatest advantage and can inflict the greatest damage.

Both special and general qualifications are requisite for the man competent to stand at the lever in the cab of a locomotive. He must possess sufficient knowledge of the complicated mechanism of an engine to be able not only to keep it in gear, but in case of accident to make promptly such slight repairs to it as may be possible with the tools carried in the engine chest. To perform his daily work with the best results he must intimately know his own engine, which is likely to have characteristics as distinct from those of other engines as one man has from another. After his engine he must give attention to the train it draws, observing whether, for example, it be light or heavy, short or long, made up of cars built for fast runs or of those calculated only for the moderate speed of freight. He must know the tracks of his run well enough to keep up to a time schedule on the darkest and stormiest night of winter, when he cannot see his way feeling it, so to speak, by the swing of the curves and the jar of side track frogs. An engineer may save fuel or waste it, preserve a boiler or burn it out, adjust his speed at sinuous and straight places, so as to reduce wear and tear to a minimum, or he may wrench or even wreck a train at a curve. And the nature of the business of railroading renders it a matter of time and difficulty to judge of his efficiency or incompetency in these respects.

Sobriety and steady nerve are qualities indispensable to an engineer. A reputation for unreliability through intemperance would drive a man out of the occupation, and no one can enter fully upon its duties without having shown that he possesses more than ordinary promptitude in emergencies.

In view of these considerations it is not difficult to see why engineers command more than average wages. Their vocation stands out from those of all other mechanics as an illustration that wages are higher in a difficult than in more easily learned occupations; in one requiring unusual mental and physical qualities than in those not subject to such requirements; in one dangerous than in those not dangerous; in one incurring grave responsibilities for life and property than in those in which there is little or no responsibility. The responsibility with which the locomotive engineer is charged is of the very highest. Any incapacity, any unreadiness, any carelessness or drunkenness on his part, may at any time cause not merely the loss of thousands of dollars to his employers, but the loss of hundreds of human lives. His mind is the mind of the rushing train. On his hand at the throttle depends the safety, not only of all that his locomotive pulls, but very often of other trains as well.

Yet there have been other important factors in determining the wages of locomotive engineers in this country. In twenty-five years the number of miles of railroad track have been trebled, creating a demand for engineers that has constantly kept pace with the supply. While eastern railroad companies have mercilessly cut wages in other departments they have been careful to retain the services of the captains and pilots of their land ships, the engineers to whom they intrust the care of millions in property and the reputation of their roads for safe passenger traffic. To keep these employees, they have in some measure been obliged to bid against the great railroads of the west.

It was under conditions such as these that the brotherhood of locomotive engineers obtained its growth. In its earlier stages it cleared its way to intelligent action through a series of costly and occasionally disastrous strikes. When experience had taught its members that for them there were safer methods of operation, it dropped the strike as a weapon, or rather consigned it temporarily to the background. It adopted as its leading feature the mutual benefit side of trades unionism, vigorously pushed its organization throughout the country, and put restricted but yet great authority as an arbitrator into the hands of its executive head. "Let us reason together," their chief would say, when waiting upon the officers of a road the engineers of which desired to make known any grounds for complaint, and he was heard, for he represented men who could cut away dividends. So the guild waxed fat and quite content.

In time, as the huge mass of the

country's labor writhed and groaned in angry discontent, the brotherhood was widely advertised as a praiseworthy example to good workmen. The order seems to have shrewdly permitted the employing class to do most of the trumpeting and the making of comparisons odious to the other unionists. But they could hardly have done it themselves. They had ample opportunity, in the usual treatment of their fellow workers, to see the sham in the talk of railroad officials at their annual reunions, in which the good engineer who was too intelligent to strike was contrasted with the bad common hand who, in his ignorance, struck so often. The engineers knew how many unions of switchmen, trackmen and brakemen had in vain remonstrated against overwork and reduction of wages. "Let us reason together!" They well knew that language like this from unskilled laborers, who could easily be replaced in case of strike, would be regarded as audacious.

And in fact they have seemed to care little for unskilled labor, or any labor other than their own. The brotherhood has been managed, and up to this time successfully managed, upon the principle that the rise or fall, the success or failure, of other labor organizations mattered nothing to members of the brotherhood. It has not only refused its aid in great strikes when its action would have been decisive, and earned among other trades unions a character for selfishness, but, as Mr. Powderly charges even while counseling Knights of Labor to refrain from retaliation, brotherhood men have on some occasions been permitted to take the places of the striking members of other organizations of engineers. In this strike at least there is nothing sentimental. It springs from no notion of "the solidarity of labor," from no conception that the principle, "an injury to one is the concern of all," has application beyond the lines of a single organization, and from no desire to help those beyond those lines.

On the other side, the officers of a great railroad, experienced and calculating business men, have decided that the market for engineers is not monopolized by men who will not sell their labor for less than the brotherhood scale, and they are risking serious immediate losses to the road, for the greater gains to come if they succeed in manning their engines with engineers who will work at rates fixed by the company. The dispatches tell us that the officers of the other great lines centered in Chicago are watching the fight with deep interest. There can be no question as to which side they desire shall win. The bonds of amity uniting the aristocracy of trades unionism with its late admirers of the great corporations have been severed, and all the value of the example of its much lauded moderation is lost.

Whichever side may be beaten, this strike, in its occurrence, has definitely settled some facts of large import. The brotherhood of locomotive engineers, like every other labor organization maintained to uphold wages, does strike when other means for accomplishing its purposes fail. A labor organization that will not strike cannot long breast the current that is ever carrying wages down.

From the very nature of their occupation the engineers constitute the strongest of all trades unions. Against them, however, is that general pressure for employment which, beginning with the laborer destitute of special skill, who is denied access to the primary means of all employment, spreads upward through all trades and occupations; and against them also is a certain jealousy, whatever it may practically amount to, which their exclusive policy, hitherto so successful, has aroused. As affecting this contest of endurance, and as of the utmost importance to the general public, it must also be remembered that under our essentially vicious system of permitting our great iron highways to become the property of private corporations, whose shares are often the counters of the gambling of the stock market, the interests of the managers of a railroad and the interests of the road itself are not merely separable, but are often diverse. It is in the power of the brotherhood engineers so long as they stand together to inflict tremendous losses upon any road against which they strike. But what if the managers of the road have sold its stock short? What if they represent some great speculator or clique of speculators who desire to get hold of its stock cheaply?

Though it has been the policy of the brotherhood of locomotive engineers never to strike in aid of any other organization, they must, if they are to stand, strike when necessary on other roads in support of their members where a strike has begun. Thus, if it be not quickly settled, the strike which has commenced on the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy system is likely to spread. What would be the result of anything like a general and protracted strike of railroad engineers can only be imagined when it is considered that the regular operation of railroads has become not merely essential to great and diverse branches of industry, but also to the sup-

ply of our great centers of population with the very necessities of life.

Faster and more sharply is the logic of events forcing the consideration of the great social problem of modern civilization upon the people of the United States. Happy will it be for them if they shall ere long see that the whole system of protection and special privilege is false and dangerous, and that justice and freedom can alone prevent the productive forces which our civilization has evolved from becoming the means of its destruction.

## THE TRUSTS RUN TO COVER.

Every effort has been made by those immediately concerned to prevent the state senate committee to investigate trusts from getting at the bottom facts concerning the great sugar combination. The secretary of the organization has been absent from the state. Witnesses summoned by the committee have been reported sick or absent, and others when placed on the stand have flatly refused to answer questions. Mr. Parsons, one of the directors of the trust, persists in his refusal to produce the agreement between the refiners, basing his refusal on his rights as counsel, and in that capacity he also coaches witnesses and advises them not to answer. If a legislative committee has no more authority than this one has in the opinion of Mr. Parsons, it is difficult to see why any such committee should be appointed.

The tactics of the sugar conspirators have been closely imitated by those interested in other trusts. The secretary of the milk combination is accidentally in Florida, where he has taken all the books and papers that might throw light on the process by which farmers are compelled to sell milk cheap and the people of New York are made to buy it dear. William Rockefeller of the Standard oil trust is in Florida when wanted to testify concerning the cotton seed oil trust, with which, of course, the Standard trust has nothing to do. The agreement on which the cotton seed oil trust is based is conveniently absent in Cincinnati, and no one can think of any way in which it could be produced in this city. A witness who acknowledges his interest in the trust, professed utter inability to answer some simple questions and under advice of counsel flatly refused to answer other questions.

All of this seems to indicate that the investigation will fail to elicit the information most desired by the public, but such a failure will not prove that the proceeding has been of no public benefit. Agreements to control vast industries; all details of which are thus sedulously concealed, must be of such a character that those concerned in them dare not allow the facts to pass into the possession of the public and its grand jurors and prosecuting officers. The written agreement which forms the constitution of the sugar trust is kept so secret that Mr. Parsons has intimated that he would go to jail rather than produce it, and Mr. Havemeyer has sworn that he is not sure that even the individuals signing it have the right to see it. No criminal secret involving the lives of a band of political conspirators was ever more closely guarded.

We doubt if any possible exposure of the operations of the trusts could do so much to influence the public mind against these new devices of monopoly as this policy of concealment. The inevitable inference is that there must be something behind all this even worse than the public had suspected. This appears to have occurred to the more astute members of the Standard oil trust, for when John D. Rockefeller was called to the stand he, after a mere formal protest, gave the committee a copy of the famous deed of trust that serves as the constitution of the Standard oil trust, and assumed an attitude of great frankness toward the committee. Either this attitude or something else had such an effect on George Bliss, one of the committee's counsel, that he handled Mr. Rockefeller with great tenderness, and even protested against pushing the investigation too far. General Pryor was less considerate, and brought out some facts that did not entirely accord with Mr. Rockefeller's claim that the greatest of all the trusts had none of the characteristics of a monopoly.

Already the hurrying of witnesses to other states and the implied threat of Mr. Havemeyer that they will move their refineries beyond the limits of this state if the legislature does not cease to "persecute" them, point to the necessity of a congressional investigation. It is clear that no state jurisdiction extends far enough to enable it to cope with these conspiracies that aim to control the trade of a continent, and the house committee on manufactures is preparing to begin such an investigation.

Even if this investigation, covering a wider range, only serves to emphasize the facts elicited by the present investigation in this city, it will be of great use. It is of less importance that a legislative remedy shall be devised than that public opinion against the growth of monopoly and the constant tendency of enormous power to concentrate in an ever lessening number of hands shall be aroused. We are entering on a presidential campaign in which the tariff will be the main issue. Nearly all of those engaged in these conspiracies to enhance prices, limit production and control the wages and opportunities for employment of labor, are

protectionists. Into the testimony showing that they close factories while guaranteeing profits to their owners but nothing to the men thrown out of work, they inject the familiar cant about the need of a tariff to protect American labor against the pauper labor of Europe. The hypocrisy of such a pretense is so bold that it must excite the derision of even those workmen who have hitherto been deluded into a belief that the protective system is maintained for their benefit. The fullest possible exposure of the tactics of these high tariff trusts will be most effective in opening the eyes of the masses to the fact that what our "protective" tariff really protects is monopolistic robbery, and not the wages of labor. Now is the time for such an exposure, and the closer the rebellion against "protection" can be linked with a general attack on all monopolies built up by legislation or conspiracy, the better will be the chance for securing a popular verdict in support of that movement. Tariff reformers in congress cannot afford to ignore the subject of trusts.

## THE TREATY AGAIN.

The proposed fisheries treaty with the British government has become a subject of sharp controversy in and out of congress. The attacks on it are as silly as was the jubilation of the negotiators over its completion. The real contention of the Americans who regard themselves as chiefly interested is for the privilege of using Canadian ports for convenience in conducting deep sea fishing, while refusing to Canadian vessels the full privilege in our own ports that is enjoyed by American vessels. The aggressive acts of the Canadians are undoubtedly designed to force the American government to come to an understanding more satisfactory to the Canadian fishermen. Canada undoubtedly inflicts considerable injury on her own people by this course, and her truculent attitude enables demagogues on this side of the line to appeal to that puerile pride and stubbornness which in international affairs is regarded as an exhibition of a proper patriotic spirit, and is formulated in such immoral cries as "our country, right or wrong." The highest patriotism is that which insists that one's country shall be right at whatever cost; and as the public conscience becomes educated, men will see that the general praise which greets such a declaration as "I would rather be right than be president" is as much greater in the mouth of a nation as a whole people is greater than an individual citizen.

The United States is unquestionably wrong in this contention, and the claim it sets up is in the interest of a few greedy citizens in one corner of the country, and in derogation of the rights and interests of the whole body of the people. This century old quarrel could be settled by one stroke of the pen eliminating the duties on fish and fish oil from our tariff. The demand of a handful of New England fishermen for the retention of those clauses is simply an extreme illustration of the brazen effrontery and essential immorality of the whole protective system. There are from sixty to seventy millions of people in these United States and not more than four or five thousand of them have even the most remote interest in preserving the duties on the products of the Atlantic fisheries. The interest of every man, woman and child among the vast remainder is to have the fish supply cheap and abundant. These few thousands not only demand that the price of fish shall be artificially kept up for their own immediate personal benefit, but when under such circumstances a neighboring people, whose fishermen are practically excluded from our ports, retaliate by denying our fishermen certain privileges in their ports, these New England fishermen actually have the criminal audacity to insist on their claims, even to the extent of going to war if need be.

There is no other possible interpretation of the eager desire of certain congressmen and newspapers to keep open this dispute and to aggravate its bitterness. In order that a few thousand American fishermen on the New England coast may be protected in their privilege of making millions of their fellow citizens pay for salted fish more than they are worth, these very victimized millions are asked to subject our seaboard cities to destruction, sacrifice their lives in a brutal fight and impose new burdens of debt on generations yet unborn. Did greed ever inspire a more wicked proposal or selfish craft ever build so openly on a faith that what Carlyle said of England's millions is true of ours—that they are "mostly fools?"

For ourselves we are glad that the proposed treaty is unsatisfactory. It could not, in the long run, prove otherwise, since it is based on false principles, and is at best a compromise with wrong and folly. Professor Goldwin Smith of Toronto openly rejoices that the mere discussion of the subject forces forward the movement for commercial union, as the only solution of the fishery and other disputes between this country and Canada. That free trade between the two countries would benefit both is manifest, since neither will sell the other its products without obtaining in return products still more desirable to it. The protectionists themselves admit that free trade between the various parts of our own country is the source of whatever prosperity we enjoy, and human ingenuity

cannot formulate a single respectable argument against the extension of the same beneficent system to this whole continent. They must see this themselves, but they fear to admit the truth, since the logic of the argument would carry us to free trade with all the world.

## VEXATIOUS LITIGATION.

It is said that no less than three thousand suits against the elevated railroad companies for damages to property along their lines are now pending. It is the policy of the managers of these roads to fight every suit of this kind step by step, and take an appeal from every decision adverse to their interests. The object is to make such litigation as costly as possible to all who engage in it, and to cause such delay in the final settlement of suits that any damages won by a plaintiff will be more than eaten up by lawyers' fees and court charges. It does not matter in the least that all of the points of law raised have been passed upon by the court of appeals; a new appeal is taken in each case for the undisputed purpose of delaying the suit.

Such tactics, which are the ordinary tactics of rich men and corporations, ought to be impossible. Justice which is not prompt is not justice at all, and these legal delays give to the long purse an advantage in our courts that practically could hardly be greater if rich defendants could openly bribe judges and buy juries. In the case of the elevated railroads one of two things is true, either the companies are or they are not liable for any proven damage they have done to property along their lines. This is a simple legal question that ought to be settled as completely in a single case before the court of appeals as in a hundred cases. Once settled in favor of the companies, other suits of the kind should be speedily disposed of by the court in which they were instituted. If, on the other hand, this question has been decided against the companies, as is claimed, then all appeals made for the express purpose of delay ought to be instantly dismissed. If the existing practice renders this impossible then the existing practice is bad, and if lawyers only wished to expedite legal proceedings they could easily suggest a way in which it could be reformed. But lawyers can no more be trusted to reform legal procedure than party managers can be trusted to reform politics. What is needed is a popular demand such as that expressed in the Syracuse platform, "We desire also to so simplify the procedure of our courts and diminish the expense of legal proceedings that the poor may be placed on an equality with the rich and the long delays which now result in scandalous miscarriages of justice may be prevented." This is one of the many reforms proposed in that platform that should be forced on the attention of all political parties by popular demand.

But there is another aspect of these suits against the elevated railroad companies of New York which deserves most serious attention. Whether these demands of damages from the elevated railroad companies have or have not any legal claim, they certainly have no claim in justice. Their suits, if they have any legal color, ought not to be defeated by delays. But our laws ought to be such as would make it impossible to bring them. However much the stockholders of these elevated roads may have possessed themselves of what really belongs to the whole people, no matter how much they have watered their stock, and how badly they treat the public by overcrowding and inefficiently lighting their cars, we ought not to permit another set of public beneficiaries to blackmail them. The suits for damage of property which have been brought against the elevated roads, and which amount in the aggregate of the claims to some twenty million dollars, are not suits for damage done to property which justly belongs to individuals, but for the lessening of land values in particular places. Now, these land values, as to which so many individuals claim to have been damaged by the erection and maintenance of these great public conveniences, the elevated railroads, are in no case the result of individual industry, but are due to the growth and improvement of the whole community and rightfully belong to the whole people of New York. The elevated companies have not profited by the great increase in land values due to the building of their roads, and they ought not to be compelled to make up what lowering in relative values the same improvements in transportation may have caused in other places. If the individuals whose lots have been reduced in value by the building of the elevated roads have any just claim for compensation, it ought to be against those whose lots have been increased in value.

The single tax on land values would remove all such difficulties. Under it the owner of any lot which was diminished in value by a public improvement would be compensated by the lessening of the taxes he was called on to pay, and the public itself, which would thus be the real loser, would get compensating benefits for this loss in the larger income from the lots which were rendered more valuable. Under this equitable system the costs for damages in making public improvements, whether in building railroads, in opening public squares or in



erecting public buildings, would only be for the damage actually done to buildings or other improvements made by individual industry and outlay.

Had the elevated railroads been built as they should have been, by the city, from a tax levied on land values, the question of damages could never have arisen. Viaducts could then have been run between the streets and the advantages and disadvantages arising from their building would have been almost automatically adjusted by the assessment of the land. Injury to houses and other personal property would have been paid for of course out of the public fund.

#### THE FIRST VICTORY FOR TARIFF REFORM.

The fixing of St. Louis as the place and June 5 as the time for holding the democratic national convention has much significance. The democratic national committee is largely made up of men who have no real sympathy with anything that Mr. Cleveland represents in politics. Barium, its chairman, and Prince, its seemingly perpetual secretary, are men of a past era who look to intrigue and compromise as the best of all possible political agencies. They are men who desire that the democratic party shall have and hold power, in order that democrats may hold office, and professions of principle are to them only a part, and a very minor part of political tactics. There are a good many other "experienced politicians" of the same kind on the national committee. It was not remarkable then that those who seek to defeat Mr. Cleveland's nomination because of his partial adherence to civil service reform ideas, and because of his utterance on the tariff question, should look to the national committee to do something that might help them.

The dispute was undoubtedly a mixed one and no single ballot can be accepted as a test vote, since preference of locality affected every ballot taken. The first vote in favor of July 3 was cast by the advocates of Chicago and San Francisco because St. Louis is notoriously a hot place in midsummer. Eastern support of the San Francisco project was influenced by a belief that local sentiment there favors a high tariff, and also by the hope that the numerous proxies to be found in a convention so far away would be more easily manipulated than the delegates direct from the people and responsible to the constituents to whom they must return. There was also a distinct prejudice against St. Louis because it is a democratic city where the local sentiment favors tariff reduction.

But the date was even more important than the place to these schemers. They desired to hold the democratic convention after the republican convention had adjourned in order that they might straddle, in some fashion, the declaration concerning the tariff that the latter is expected to make. They felt sure that under existing circumstances a democratic convention taking the initiative on this question would make a much more positive declaration than the cowards and trimmers in that party desire. Added to all this was a general wish to inspire hope among all the little coteries who are eager to defeat Mr. Cleveland's renomination but afraid to try unless success is certain.

Under all the circumstances it is a very significant fact that the national committee finally felt compelled to unanimously choose St. Louis as the meeting place and to name a date in advance of that fixed for the meeting of the republican convention. It was not merely a deference to public sentiment, but a confession, after fully looking over the field, that the Hill boom and other petty schemes for defeating Mr. Cleveland's nomination are impracticable, and that, under the circumstances, the wishes of the president's real friends had better be respected. The only men of influence in the democratic party who desire Mr. Cleveland's defeat thus confess that his nomination is a foregone conclusion, and they see that his tariff message must be taken along with him.

What the democrats in congress will do this year toward tariff reduction remains to be seen. They certainly appear to be in no hurry to begin. They ought now to bring in a measure that represents the real opinion of a large majority of the democratic congressmen, and resolutely put aside all temptations to accept any tinkering compromise with a view to securing the support of the so-called high tariff democrats. It will be better for them to have a good bill defeated through treachery and desertion than to secure the passage of an unsatisfactory bill. No measure short of that outlined in the president's message will meet the case either in congress or convention. No matter what bill is proposed in Washington or what plank is adopted at St. Louis, the fight is going to turn on the message, and the democrats must defend the principles therein enunciated or submit to ignominious defeat. The time for dodging tariff planks, capable of two or three different interpretations, has gone by, and the great issue must now be squarely met, be the immediate consequences what they may. Going forward offers the democrats their only chance of success. To turn back or falter now would make their defeat certain and disastrous.

#### NEXT—THE GLASS BLOWERS.

Not very long ago Mr. Powderly publicly declared that it was his habit when he bought ginger ale to break the bottles after using the beverage. His object in doing this was to make work for glass blowers. It is by no means probable that glass blowers like to work any more than other people, and at first one might be tempted to ask why Mr. Powderly, whose fame is that of a friend of workingmen,

should wish to burden any class of workingmen, even glass blowers, with unnecessary work. But Mr. Powderly is not a fool. He had a reason, and a reason growing out of the best of motives, for the habit of which he boasted. His real purpose was not to make unnecessary work for glass blowers for the sake of the work, but for the sake of the wages they would get. The distribution of labor products is so unnatural and unjust that the destruction of any kind of product tends to maintain or improve the wages of its producer. Hence, if ginger ale bottles are used but once there will be work for glass blowers with every output of ginger ale; whereas, if the bottles are used over and over again the falling off of demand for bottles may menace the wages of glass blowers. It was this that led Mr. Powderly to adopt and recommend the breaking of ginger ale bottles. It is true that in doing so he allowed the interests of bottle blowers to obscure the interests of ginger ale producers, whose products are restricted to a narrower market in consequence of the enhanced expense of the ginger ale habit, and of bottle junkmen, whose raw material is thereby diminished, to say nothing of the interests of the much larger class to which he himself belongs—the consumer of ginger ale and other temperance drinks. But there can be no doubt that the tendency of his plan was to benefit glass blowers.

It is not by the re-use of ginger ale bottles alone, however, that the wages of glass blowers are threatened. Any invention which will produce bottles with less labor will have the same effect. And just such an invention is now in operation in England, and will soon be in use here. By this invention one man and two boys can make ten times as many bottles as under present methods can be made by two men and three boys. Mr. Powderly's capacity for ginger ale must be extraordinary indeed if he can by breaking his ginger ale bottles stem this tide of bottles that threatens to overwhelm the trade of the bottle makers.

Bottles are now produced by hand—that is to say, by mouth. The workman gathers the glass out of the furnace on the end of a blow pipe. Another workman takes the pipe, and after blowing a bubble in the glass, rolls it for the purpose of drawing it out to the required length. All this is better done with the new machine by the automatic action of a lever or crank. The next step is to put the partly blown bottle into a mold and blow into it through the pipe. This, too, is done with the machine by an automatic movement, the mold being fed continuously from the furnace and the blowing being done by machinery. The third step is now performed by a boy, who cuts the bottle from the blow pipe, a step that is not necessary in the machine manufacture, since the glass is never welded to any part of it. The fourth step is the shaping of the ring around the mouth of the bottle, a difficult operation requiring great skill. But with the machine the ring is formed in the mold. Thus, while two men and three boys now make in England about eight gross of bottles a day, the machine enables one man and two boys to make eighty gross.

This invention ought to be a good thing for everybody—even for Mr. Powderly, since it would enable him to drink more ginger ale and break more bottles at the same expense, or to indulge in the same amount of ginger ale drinking and bottle breaking, at a less expense. By it bottles are made cheaper, and the contents of bottles are to be bought cheaper. But instead of being a good thing for bottle blowers it menaces their livelihood and the very existence of their art.

Even if the demand for bottles should multiply ten times, one of every two skilled craftsmen who make bottles would be thrown out of employment and the other would have the alternative of accepting unskilled wages or abandoning his job to an unskilled workman, and it is doubtful if it is possible to destroy enough ginger ale bottles to counteract this effect. Nor will the injury end with the glass blowers' trade. With one glass blower out of every two hunting for a job, spurred on by the shadow of the wolf, and the second of the two working at less than his accustomed pay and ready to take the first better job that offers, the effect on other occupations will be like that of an invasion of laborers.

Following the logic of the protective tariff, after which Mr. Powderly's bottle breaking scheme was planned, the only way of avoiding this catastrophe is to break the bottle making machines as rapidly as they are made. This would kill two birds with one stone. It would not only keep up the supply of work for glass blowers, which could be augmented by breaking every bottle as soon as it had been once used, but it would also make work for machinists in repairing or rebuilding the bottle making machines as rapidly as they were destroyed. Of course this destructive process should be carried on according to law. Destruction by the mob could not be tolerated. There should be surveys, appraisers, inspectors and detectives selected from the more active partisans of the dominant party, whose duty it should be to ferret out second hand bottles and contraband bottle making machines, and after appraising their value, and condemning them by due process of law in a regularly constituted court of justice, to turn them over to the marshal or sheriff for destruction, the owner to be repaid his loss out of the public treasury. This suggestion, which would afford an efficient means of reducing the surplus without reducing taxation, is submitted to

the candid consideration of Mr. Andrew Carnegie and other captains of industry, who so desire protection for the sake of the workingman.

The principle is capable of indefinite extension. By breaking bugles after the first ride, sinking ships after the first voyage, killing cows after the birth of the first calf, burning houses after the first year's occupancy, felling trees after the first season's bearing, pulling down churches after the preaching of the first sermon, and encouraging the heathen to eat missionaries when they had made their first convert, we should at once create a great demand for American labor on sound Pennsylvania principles, and enable congress to levy the highest taxes without any danger of a surplus.

But the evils which Mr. Powderly sought to modify and which sincere protectionists deplore, can neither be cured nor lessened by destroying products or by discouraging invention, or what is in principle the same thing, by making protective tariffs. Their cause is rooted in our social system. Though manifested in the displacement of labor, it is not displacement, but displacement without the opportunity for replacement, that makes invention seem a curse, and suggests protective tariffs and the breaking of ginger ale bottles by way of remedy.

The affection of most glass blowers for their trade is not strong enough to hold them when better opportunities in other employments offer; nor is it strong enough to worry them if invention or bottle saving diminishes demand for their work, provided they can readily obtain other work just as profitable. In the natural order of things they could do this, but our laws have disturbed the natural order of things. By taxing houses, furniture, cattle, machinery and other products of labor we so increase the price as to narrow the market. This limits demand for labor in every industry on which the tax is levied. By imposing protective tariffs on foreign goods, we add to the price of both the foreign and the domestic article, so that labor in handling, transporting and dealing in both is in less demand than it would be. Finally, and fundamentally, we tax land values so moderately, such a large part of our public revenues being derived from taxes on labor, that most of our land is kept out of use. Whoever would have a house must first pay a land owner for the privilege of building. Whoever would go into business of any kind must first solicit the privilege of a land owner, whose price he must pay or abandon his enterprise. And of what the landlord gets a very small part goes to the people. The inevitable result of such a system is to contract, and contract, and again contract, opportunities for business and opportunities for employment. To expect labor to flourish on such conditions is to expect lilies to bloom in potato cellars.

**LANDLORDS' RIGHTS DEFINED.**  
Upward of four hundred crofters on the island of Lewis recently presented to their landlord, Lady Matheson, a most humble petition declaring that they can hardly eke out a bare existence on their little plots of land, much less pay rent, and asking that their ancient and hereditary township lands now lying waste be restored to them. The men presented their petition in person, and were, according to the *London Standard*, "very orderly and well behaved." They were willing to have the land court fix the rent, and all that they asked was enough space on the island on which they were born to enable them to earn a living.

The petitioners received no satisfaction. Lady Matheson bluntly refused their request, and suggested that her tenants should sell their cattle or engage in fishing to enable them to pay her rent on their present holdings. If they could not do that she hinted to them that they had better emigrate. The spokesman of the crofters replied that so long as lands on the island suitable for cultivation were occupied by sheep and deer the natives did not feel inclined to emigrate. This appears to have irritated Lady Matheson, and she declared, "These lands are my property and you have nothing to do with them."

This is simply a bold assertion of the legal rights of landlords. If Lady Matheson has the absolute ownership in the island of Lewis that she thus asserts, then she is the absolute monarch of her domain; she has the right to compel these cotters to emigrate from the place where they and their fathers were born, and should they refuse she may, if all other means fail, drive the intruders on her property off of the island and into the sea. If that be true of Lewis, it must be equally true of the larger island of Great Britain. If it be true of Great Britain, it applies to each continent separately and to the earth as a whole. There is no escape from this conclusion. If ownership in land is absolute, a combination of the landlords of the world would have the right, even though they lacked the power, to drive the vast majority of the human race off the face of the earth.

Such a theory is obviously absurd. It is an offensive assertion of despotic power inconsistent with peaceful civilized government. Put aside the fear of England's interference, and Lady Matheson's tenants would doubtless have made the natural and logical answer to her denial of their right to live on the island on which they were born, by declaring that if any one must leave the island it must be she rather than they; and any general assertion of such a right by the combined owners of the earth would lead to a prompt denial, and if pushed, to a war of extermination

against landlords. A higher law than any ever written on parchment warrants men in refusing to starve in the sight of opportunities to earn a living from which they are shut out by the greed, pride or caprice of a minority. Landlordism as defined by Lady Matheson is inconsistent with free government or civilization. It is simple brutal assertion of the right of force, the last answer to which is a physical test of strength.

Lady Matheson probably did not understand the full extent of the power she claimed over the people of Lewis by her assertion that the island was hers and the other inhabitants had nothing to do with it. A picture of her printed in the *London Democrat* does not suggest that she is a consciously bad woman. On the contrary, it indicates that she is an amiable though somewhat stupid person. We can hardly imagine her in the act of driving a large number of helpless men, women and children into the sea, or of complacently seeing them starve. Yet she boldly asserts the right to do the former and actually assists in doing the latter. This she does, not because she is cruel and vicious, but because she is a part of a cruel and vicious system, and has been educated to believe that duty to her own class demands that she shall religiously stand up for landlords' rights. It is the curse of so unjust a system that it not only degrades its victims but destroys humanity and moral sense in its beneficiaries.

There is no essential difference between private ownership of land in Great Britain and the private ownership of land in the United States. In the former country, however, both the origin and ultimate results of the system are more obvious. The law of primogeniture itself is a direct outgrowth of the system that preceded private ownership in land. Every baron who held land was bound to render service to the crown and every knight holding under the baron was bound to join in rendering such service, and always at his own cost. Dividing estates would have given many instances in which knights, and even barons, might not have been able to thus equip themselves at their own cost and serve without pay, and hence the obligation to serve, and the land necessary to enable its possessor to meet that obligation, passed to the elder son alone.

So clearly was this condition of tenure recognized that there are instances where the elder son was ousted in favor of a younger son because the latter was "the better knight." Again, when a landlord died leaving a son under age the crown "resumed" the land until the heir was of age to render the service by virtue of which he was entitled to claim it. If a landlord left a daughter and no son possession of the land was "resumed" and held until she married some one approved by the crown, because she, as a woman, could not put on armor and render the state the service which alone gave the right to hold land. All these customs which have in a modified form come down to our own day show that British land was originally the property of the crown, or, in other words, of the whole people, while the smaller area and denser population bring into clearer relief that landlords' right is other people's wrong. In our own country the advocates of landlordism seem to be possessed by the delusion that the people through whom they trace their title actually made the land and held it by natural right, and they make the monstrous claim asserted by Lady Matheson without realizing to what it logically leads.

#### A CHANCE FOR MISSIONARY WORK.

The Reverend Edward Ferguson's appearance at Zanzibar, after his friends had for more than a year mourned him as dead, is a striking illustration of the uncertainty of African travel, and the untrustworthiness of the information that filters to the outside world from the interior of the dark continent. In December, 1886, the noted Arab slave dealer, Sadi ben Ali, brought to Stanley Pool a circumstantial account of Mr. Ferguson's death at the hands of the Lamut tribe. The lost explorer was fittingly mourned by his family and friends; a tablet to his memory was erected by the geographical society in the Episcopal church of his native Massachusetts village; and even his life insurance was paid to his heirs without a question. And lo! in January, 1888, the reverend gentleman walks calmly into Zanzibar, ragged, dirty, hungry, but in good health and spirits, and with a journal of his wanderings, which, when given to the world, will probably solve some of the most vexed problems of central African geography. Meantime a letter to a friend in New York narrates some of the most striking episodes of his wanderings, one of which is of special interest to sociologists, as it illustrates how strangely men can be blinded, not only to their moral obligations, but even to their own interests, when unlightened by Christian civilization.

Nearly the whole of the year 1885 was spent by Mr. Ferguson in the exploration of the great Mbo Mbo lake, whose shore line of over eight hundred miles he carefully surveyed, and whose outlet he traced sufficiently to make certain that this hitherto mysterious mediterranean sea is in reality one of the chief feeders of the Congo. Settled on the shores of the lake, Mr. Ferguson found two branches of the great Miam Miam tribe—the Sguni and Nyootas, between whom a state of smothered war has existed for generations. The nature of this feud, and his almost futile efforts for its termination, are detailed in Mr. Ferguson's letter.

The Sguni are settled around the northern shores of the Mbo Mbo, and the Nyootas at the southern end, their chief village, Inyoodi, commanding the outlet. Now the waters of the lake are vastly

deeper at the northern end than at the southern, and in these deep, cool waters fish of an exquisite quality—Mr. Ferguson compares them to our Otsego bass—are found in enormous numbers. It is these fish that have caused all the trouble between two peoples who, but for this kindly provision of nature, would probably be living in peace and harmony. The Sguni claimed the exclusive ownership of the fish and forcibly prevented the Nyootas from catching them, sinking and destroying their boats and imprisoning their fishermen; and the Nyootas, by way of retaliation, refused to buy any fish from the Sguni except on condition that out of every three fish brought to their market two should be thrown away. Thus not only were the bounties of nature wasted and left unused by those who should have enjoyed them, but a fatal spirit of enmity and jealousy was fostered between two kindred people. The country of the Sguni is densely wooded, while that of the Nyootas has been largely cleared; but the Nyootas persist in felling their remaining stock of trees, and obstinately refuse to buy from the Sguni. The Sguni, on the other hand, are large consumers of cotton and woolen cloth, which the Nyootas weave themselves, and buy from the Arab traders who visit Inyoodi; yet a Nyoota merchant, bringing cloth into the Sguni country, is treated as a public enemy, and subjected to vexatious fines, and often to imprisonment.

Against these queer ideas, so opposed to self-interest and to the principles of Christianity, Mr. Ferguson for many months battled in vain. The Sguni could not be brought to admit that on every principle of human brotherhood the Nyootas had an equal right to the fish in the lake. The Nyootas obstinately declined to understand that by refusing to buy fish from the Sguni they were chiefly injuring themselves, or to see the folly of cutting down their own few trees when they could just as well get an unlimited supply of lumber from the Sguni at less cost. In short, each tribe seemed chiefly anxious to hinder the prosperity of the other, without realizing that in doing so they were necessarily making life more difficult for themselves. To preach the gospel of the golden rule to people of such unconquerably barbarous instincts was a manifest absurdity.

However, the good missionary's efforts were not absolutely fruitless. Before his departure from the Mbo Mbo, Mr. Ferguson succeeded in introducing at least the thin end of the wedge of Christian teaching. At a grand pow-wow held in November, 1885, the Sguni agreed to a considerable enlargement of the limits within which the Nyootas might do their fishing, with the understanding that the whole lake should be thrown open to them if at any future time they should decide to let the Sgunis come to their towns to exchange fish for cloth. There was, however, very little prospect that the Nyootas would soon enlarge their market for cloth in this way; and, indeed, the Rev. Mr. Ferguson naively confesses the opinion that even this trifling concession was made chiefly to induce him to betake himself and his Christian teachings out of the country.

Of course these poor central African savages will not be left in their darkness. The matter will be brought before the various missionary societies of America and England, and it cannot be long before a band of devoted men and women shall be on the way to the shores of the Mbo Mbo, intent on carrying to the Sguni and Nyootas that gospel of fellowship and brotherly love that has made our western civilization the glorious thing it is.

Indeed, Mr. George W. Childs, the well known philanthropist of Philadelphia; Mr. John Wanamaker, the famous Sunday school superintendent of the same city; Mr. Chauncey M. Depew, and other large-hearted and large-minded Christians have already indicated their willingness to contribute largely toward putting an end to this stupid warfare of ignorant savages, by spreading among them the light of that gospel which teaches us Christians that the true interest of tribes and nations lies in promoting each other's prosperity and not in retarding it.

The march of events brings the tariff question more and more to the front. Mr. Blaine, interviewed by a *World* reporter in Florence, declares explicitly that he will not be a candidate for the presidency, but resents the imputation that his refusal is based on a fear of defeat. He insists that the republican party is sure of success because the president's message has forced the tariff question into politics and there is now no escape from the issue by the democratic party. On that issue Mr. Blaine evidently thinks that the republicans are sure to win.

Mr. Blaine is not alone in this opinion. Chauncey M. Depew in a speech made before the Union League club at Chicago on February 22 celebrated that anniversary by revealing his own ambition to occupy the chair once filled by Washington. Mr. Depew gave more attention to dead issues and war memories than could have been reasonably expected from so live a man; but he came out strongly for the everlasting maintenance of a war tariff—the higher the better—surplus or no surplus. The Albany Blaine men account this the bugle blast of a born leader of men, and already the cry with them is "The king is dead; long live the king!" One of them is declared to a reporter that "Depew is sound on the tariff, and that will be the issue."

Nothing could be better than the nomination of Depew. For years he was the

attorney who managed the Albany lobby of the New York Central railroad. Since the management of that great corporation fell from the hands of William H. Vanderbilt to the hands of his sons, these young men have not only saved their minds from much stain by calling Mr. Depew to the presidency of their road. For years he has been the attorney of monopoly, and now he is the head of one of those great corporations that do not hesitate to control legislation for their own benefit and against the public interests. Such a man would be an ideal candidate for a party that proposed to fight a great national campaign on the issue that the few have a right to use the whole power of the federal government to assist them in their private business by aiding them to levy a tax on all the other people of the country for their own private, pecuniary advantage. Mr. Depew would make a particularly charming leader for a high tariff, monopoly-perpetuating party with a "workingman's" anti-monopoly annex.

But while there come from all quarters evidences that the republicans do not intend to let the democrats make any cowardly retreat from the position in which Mr. Cleveland has placed them, there are corresponding evidences that the democratic papers and leaders begin to comprehend that they must defend tariff reduction and attack the absurd protective delusion. The *World* is actually able to refer to the republican accusation that the democrats are free traders, without manifesting any signs of dangerous rage, and in answer to the *Sun's* declaration that New York and New Jersey will go with the republicans on the tariff reduction issue, it reminds its hated contemporary that Tilden carried both states "on a platform far more pronounced against a high tariff than the president's late message was, and containing no recognition whatever of the principle of protection." Just so; and therein the platform of 1876 was greatly superior to the message of 1888. If the democrats do not muster up enough courage to attack and demolish that delusion, the delusion will demolish them.

In this, their hour of tribulation, timid democratic papers ought to refresh their souls now and then by reading that platform of 1876, in which the existing tariff was denounced as "a masterpiece of injustice, inequality and false pretense." Here are a few of the counts in the indictment it brought against the sacred protective tariff:

It has impoverished many industries to subsidize a few.

It prohibits imports that might purchase the products of American labor.

It has degraded American commerce from the first to an inferior rank on the high seas.

It has cut down the sales of American manufacturers at home and abroad, and depleted the returns of American agriculture—an industry followed by half our people.

It costs the people five times more than it produces to the treasury, obstructs the processes of production and wastes the fruits of labor.

It promotes fraud, fosters smuggling, enriches dishonest officials and bankrupts honest merchants.

We demand that the custom house taxation shall be only for revenue.

Where is the dalliance with the protective delusion in that platform? Let the shaking cowards who are scared about New York and New Jersey read it. On that platform in 1876 Mr. Tilden carried New York by over 32,000, New Jersey by over 12,000 and Connecticut by 1,712. No democratic candidate on a tariff straddling platform has done as well since.

An amusing illustration of the absurdity of the attempt to commit wage workers to the maintenance of the existing tariff is found in the organization of manufacturers recently formed in Philadelphia. This is no association of a social nature, but proposes to devote itself strictly to business. It has two objects, and two only. The first is to assure concerted action by all protected manufacturers for the preservation of the existing tariff, and the second is to combine them, as one man, in resisting strikes for higher wages against any individual member of the association. Is it possible that any workingman can be found, even in Philadelphia, who is capable of believing that these men want a tariff to protect American labor and maintain high wages?

The New York Times prints reports of interviews with a number of leading republicans in Minnesota, which give further evidence of the lack of sympathy there with the apparent disposition of the party to insist on the maintenance of the existing war tariff. There is the usual talk about "protection," but the governor, state treasurer, secretary of state and numerous other officials and party leaders declare emphatically in favor of a material reduction in the present tariff. It may become necessary to exclude Minnesota in order to assure harmony in the next republican national convention. Such talk as that quoted is not regarded as republicanism here and hereabout.

It is a curious fact, and one of special interest to the numerous free traders in the united labor party, that the Tammany machine has recently been committed to high tariff views, and that it now bases its secret opposition to the renomination of Mr. Cleveland on his message in favor of tariff reduction. In private conversation Tammany leaders say that this wide departure by their organization from the views it professed in the days of John Kelly is based on a conviction that the workingmen of New York are at heart protectionists. Considering the events of the past few years, it is somewhat amusing to see Tammany step forward as the rep-



representative of working men possessed of views on any great question of national policy. Unless grave injustice has been done, it was by something vastly different from arguments on protection that Tammany won the favor of those workmen who voted with it last fall. Any members of the united labor party who comprehend the full meaning of the proposal to put all taxes on land values and to abolish all other taxes, would find that politics had indeed given them strange bed fellows, if they should find themselves next fall using the same pretense that Tammany now puts forth to justify them in seeking by indirection to defeat a ticket that Tammany was treacherously knifing under the counsel and direction of the New York Sun. It would be difficult for the imagination to conceive of a more incongruous combination.

The house committee on territories has agreed to report to congress a bill for admitting the territories of Dakota, Washington, Montana and New Mexico as states. The committee suggests that the name of Washington be changed to Trumoh, and that of New Mexico to Montezuma. The measure is one dictated by partisan considerations, as Dakota is really the only territory that has a population demanding its early admission as a state, though the propriety of admitting it as a single state is very questionable. One argument in favor of its admission, as now organized, is that otherwise another comparatively small population will secure a representation equal to that of the greatest state in the senate, but this argument is equally strong against the admission of the other territories named. The result of their admission would probably be a considerable accession to the body of United States senators who already practically hold their seats by purchase. Such considerations are, however, likely to weigh but little with modern politicians, and it is due to justice to say that they have had just about as little weight with politicians in the past. Territorial admissions have generally been accomplished through bargain and compromise. No bill will be passed admitting the territories named to the Union in time to participate in the next presidential election. The democrats have never yet recovered from the disgust inspired by the recollection that it was their own act in admitting Colorado in 1876 that made possible the inauguration of Mr. Hayes. They will take no more such risks. This is the reason that Dakota will not be admitted alone, and it is but just to say that it is the certainty that Dakota will be a republican state that makes the republicans in congress so eager for its immediate admission.

One interesting fact about the report of the committee on territories is the deliberate refusal to make use of the customary phrase "all male citizens" in describing the voters entitled to participate in the formation of the proposed new state. In Washington territory women now vote, and objection was made to the use of the phrase quoted on the ground that it would deprive these women of their existing rights. After a lively debate there was a tie vote on the motion to limit the voters to males, and Chairman Springer gave his casting vote against such restriction. It is difficult to imagine any theory of self-governing democracy that would warrant congress in depriving women of the right to vote where by common consent of the community they already have that right. The truth is that all arguments against woman suffrage are based on sentimental considerations or on ideas of expediency or convenience. Now that the ability to bear arms has ceased to be a prerequisite to citizenship, no logical argument can be advanced justifying men in refusing to women the right to vote. Our theory is that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and if any woman wishes to take part in making the laws by which she must abide, it is difficult to conceive of any right that all the other men and women of a state have to deny her the opportunity she demands. They have the power, of course, but power and right are very different things.

Charles Francis Adams proposes that the government shall grant to the Union Pacific railroad company still easier terms than are proposed by the majority of the Pacific railroad commission, and offers as further security a mortgage on the terminal grounds of the company at Omaha, Kansas City and Denver. Mr. Adams admits that these lands are already mortgaged nearly up to their present value, but thinks that the government mortgage would become valuable as these lands advanced in selling price through the growth of population in the cities named. What would become of this purely speculative value if during the fifty years during which it is proposed that the mortgage shall run the people of Omaha, Kansas and Denver should become wise enough to appropriate to their own use, by means of taxation, these now uncreated values that Mr. Adams so confidently offers as the property of his company as the basis for a mortgage? If congress really wishes to do justice to the American people it will take possession of both these Pacific roads, their terminal grounds and a good deal more, and even then it will not recoup itself for what the companies have stolen from it.

Corporation Counsel Beekman has given to Mayor Hewitt an official opinion that there is no constitutional obstacle to the passage by the legislature of an act granting to the corporation of New York the right to build elevated railroads. Mr. Beekman is preparing such a bill, and his

assistant, Francis M. Scott, says that he shall soon go to Albany to advocate its passage.

At the dinner of the Commonwealth club on Monday evening the mayor's proposal was the topic for consideration. W. J. Coombe delivered a carefully prepared speech advocating the proposal that the city shall build and operate rapid transit roads, but opposing the suggestion that any such road when built shall be leased to the New York Central or any other corporation. Simon Sterne followed in support of Mr. Coombe's speech, and said that he took occasion to recant some of his views and to confess that government assistance and management are good things in some cases. He said that if the city had retained the franchises it has given away its taxes would be much lower, and declared his belief that all the robberies of the Tweed ring were small in comparison with our losses through the giving away of rapid transit franchises.

The applause indicated that this conservative body of men were in full sympathy with the speakers. The incident as a whole is one that affords much reasonable gratification to all who seek to bring about the maintenance of public rights. It indicates that the day is not far distant when such men will see the fundamental error that underlies the received political economy. For those who have come to see the wrong and impolicy of granting to individuals such franchises as those of the elevated roads, the day is not far distant when they will acknowledge the wickedness of granting to individuals that far more important and valuable franchise—the right to control the use of the earth, and to profit by those values arising from the growth and improvement of the whole community.

Justice Dykman of the supreme court has recently decided that the law does not permit a person to make any provision by contract for the management or disposition of his property after death. It is highly satisfactory to find that there is some check on the tendency to permit the dead to manage and control this earth after they have left it. The more closely we approach to conformity with Jefferson's declaration that the earth belongs in usufruct to the living and that the dead have no rights over it, the better it will be for the living.

William Saunders is doing excellent work in Scotland in exposing the error into which Alfred Russell Wallace fell in asserting that vacant lands in this country are taxed at their selling value. The London Democrat republishes Mr. Saunders's letter with comments that show that it fully understands the blunder of Mr. Wallace. If its editor would have some definite information on the subject we advise him to read the article entitled "The Tax on Buildings" in this issue of THE STANDARD. Mr. Wallace's error has now been so thoroughly refuted that he owes it to the public that he shall confess it and retract the assertions that he has based upon it.

Justice is the name of the weekly paper recently started by the friends of the single tax in Philadelphia, and justice is its aim and policy. It is filled with good things, and keeps up with the news of the movement, and has a large field before it in the work of converting Pennsylvania to the sound economic view that what labor needs is not protection, but justice.

The Prince of Wales as an Advocate of "Confiscation."

Hamilton (Ont.) Times. In 1878 a royal commission in England, among whose members were the prince of Wales, Professor Caird, Cardinal Manning, Lord Salisbury, George J. Goschen, Lord Cross, E. Dwyer Gray, Henry Broadhurst, Jesse Collings, Samuel Morley, Charles W. Dilke and others, presented a report from which the following extract is taken: "At present land available for building in the neighborhood of our populous centers, though its capital value is very great, is probably producing a small yearly return until it is let for building. The owners of this land are not in relation to the real value, but to the actual annual income. They can thus afford to keep their land out of the market and to part with only small quantities so as to raise the price beyond the natural monopoly price which the land would command by its own advantages of position. Meantime the general expenditure of the town or improvement is increasing the value of their property. If this land were rated at, say four percent on its selling value, the owners would have a more direct incentive to part with it to those who are desirous of building, and a two fold advantage would result to the community. First, all the valuable property would contribute to the rates and the burden on the occupiers would be diminished by the increase in the rateable property. Secondly, the owners of the building land would be forced to offer their land for sale, and thus competition with one another would bring down the price of building land, and diminish the tax in the shape of ground rent, or prices paid for land which is now levied on urban enterprise by the adjacent land holders, a tax it is remembered which is no recompense for any industry or expenditure on their part, but is the natural result of the industry and activity of the towns people themselves. Your majesty's commissioners would recommend that these matters should be included in legislation when the law of reversion comes to be dealt with by parliament."

Where a Protection Reigns and Strikes Flourish. Indianapolis News. Labor strikes flourish in a small group of states—Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Ohio. Seventy-three percent of the 340,854 persons engaged in strikes last year were in those states. In Pennsylvania were the largest number—111,317. New York comes next with 62,650, the two states furnishing more than one-half of all. New Jersey is third with 27,503, Ohio fourth with 22,835, Massachusetts fifth with 22,650. More than two-thirds of the \$13,500,000 in wages sacrificed by strikes during the year were in the five states named. You will note that the greater part of the "protected" industries. There the rates of wages are lower too than in other industries that owe nothing to protection. The rate of wages is a demonstration and distress, the struggle to keep the rate above the starvation level are greatest.

The Canton, O., Anti-Poverty Society. CANTON, O.—At the last meeting of our anti-poverty society we adopted a constitution, under which the following officers were elected: President, A. E. Knisely; vice-president, Joshua Hunt; secretary, Charles Raedel; treasurer, A. U. Knisely; chorister, A. Waltz; executive committee, W. D. Meridith, A. J. Kintz, S. Harmon, M. D. The executive committee organized immediately by electing W. D. Meridith chairman, who,

## STATISTICS THAT INSTRUCT.

The Financial Reform Almanac and What It Tells—The People Who Own Great Britain and Ireland.

THE STANDARD has received from the Financial reform association, 18 Hackney Hey, Liverpool, the "Financial Reform Almanac" for 1888. It is a pamphlet of 200 pages, packed with statistical information relating to the public receipts and expenditures of Great Britain and cognate subjects. The association, which was established in 1848, advocates economical government, just taxation and perfect freedom of trade. It demands a single and equitable system of direct taxation "in lieu of the present unequal complicated and expensively collected duties upon commodities," and the continuation of tariff reforms, "until the last chain laid upon human industry and skill be broken and the last duty abolished," and insists upon a revision of the land laws and a readjustment of the land tax. In order to throw light on the way to proceed in these reforms, the association has had compiled from the best available sources, mainly official, statements of fact in respect to every question of import to the taxpayer. The index embraces several hundred subjects.

Social questions in Great Britain are so closely related to those of America that a citizen of our country will find this "Almanac" quite as instructive in parts as if it were an American publication. Especially is this true in regard to the chapter on the land question. The land of Great Britain has for many generations been doing what every intelligent subject to combined effort will do—employing governmental agencies for its benefit and vigorously pushing its own fortunes to the detriment of all other interests. The Almanac points out that Mr. Samuel Laing, M. P., has ably demonstrated that the landlords of Great Britain have received fifty million pounds over market value from the people through railway companies' purchases. Their landed estates have been thereby increased one hundred and fifty million pounds in value, not to speak of the relief afforded by the large share of local taxation borne by these railways, which Mr. Laing estimates at one-half:

	1854.	1863.	1868.	1873.	1884.
Land paid, per cent.	48	48	48	48	48
Houses, per cent.	28	43	48	53	53
Railways, per cent.	(nil)	3	8	13	16
Other property, per cent.	8	11	10	10	10

As an instance of the way in which the last generation of peers dealt with railways the fact is recalled that in 1818 the house of lords threw out the first Stockton railway bill for fear of disturbing the duke of Cleveland's fox covers. These very rails have since made his successor a Croesus. The mode of opposition by some peers of the present generation is illustrated in these two typical cases. In 1878 Lord Beaumont claimed £20,000 for one and one-eighth acres of ground at Fulham, wanted for the Metropolitan district railway. A jury awarded him £7,250. In 1884 Lord Derby demanded £200 an acre for common agricultural land in the vicinity of Bury, for which a jury gave £107 as the fair value.

The Almanac compiles from the Domesday returns of 1874, which it says greatly understates the facts as to the size of the large landed estates, the following statement:

In England and Wales—  
12 persons own 1,038,853 acres.  
66 persons own 1,917,078 acres.  
100 persons own 3,217,641 acres.  
200 persons own 5,267,781 acres, or about one-sixth of the enclosed land.  
523 persons own one-fifth of all England and Wales.  
710 persons own one-fourth of all England and Wales.  
574 persons own 9,267,081 acres.  
10,207 persons own two-thirds of all England and Wales.

One man owns over 184,597 acres in England; another, 102,755 acres; a third, 45,500 acres, or more than half of England and Wales.

In Scotland, where the total area is 13,946,044 acres:

One man owns 1,256,000 acres, and has, besides, 23,066 acres in England; total, 1,279,066 acres.  
Another has 431,900 acres.  
Another has 404,500 acres.  
Another has 305,500 acres.  
12 owners have 4,287,222 acres, about a quarter of Scotland, and more than the entire area of Wales.

20 persons hold more than 1,200,000 acres.  
24 owners hold more than 4,915,888 (a fourth of Scotland).  
70 owners hold about 9,949,000 (a half of Scotland).  
71 owners hold about 11,029,228.  
330 owners hold two-thirds of Scotland.  
1,700 owners hold nine-tenths of Scotland.

In Ireland, where the total area is 20,159,677 acres—

1 person owns 1,207,189 acres.  
12 persons own 1,207,189 acres.  
8 persons own over 100,000 acres each.  
14 persons own over 50,000 acres each.  
60 persons own over 20,000 acres each.  
133 persons own over 10,000 acres each.  
432 persons own over 5,000 acres each.  
223 persons own 6,438,100 acres (nearly one-third of the island).  
1,942 persons own 6,612,728 acres (nearly one-half of the island).  
1,942 persons own two-thirds of Ireland.

In Scotland more than 2,000,000 acres have been depopulated and cleared of thousands of sheep to make room for deer forests. Of four highland counties of Scotland, having an area of 8,650,100 acres, the extent of land under cultivation is only 419,385 acres, the rest being left for deer and other wild animals.

With reference to land tax reform the Almanac says that the tax on land now yields an annual revenue of a little over a million sterling and holds a comparatively humble position in the fiscal system of the country, but its importance is by no means adequately estimated if regarded solely from this point of view. It holds a place of primary importance in the history of British taxes, and the means are suggested by which "this ghost" of a once substantial tax may be restored to its ancient position in the national exchequer. During the reigns of the Norman and Plantagenet kings the national charges were almost wholly drawn from the land, but from about the year 1334 onward, personal property was laid under contribution, and customs duties were from 1383 regularly levied on certain descriptions of imported articles. In the reigns of William III and Anne one-third of the total revenues were supplied by the land tax, the crown lands having been granted away and the feudal payments abolished. The average revenue in those reigns amounted to four and a half millions.

The Almanac contains much useful and interesting information concerning the appropriation of common lands by the large land holders, the absentee landlords of Ireland, the ancient land tenures, the statistics of agriculture, with other facts and figures bearing on the land question. In all, the pamphlet is highly valuable as, what it is announced to be, "a valuable mecum for fiscal reformers, free traders, politicians, public speakers and writers." The price is one shilling.

The Canton, O., Anti-Poverty Society.

CANTON, O.—At the last meeting of our anti-poverty society we adopted a constitution, under which the following officers were elected: President, A. E. Knisely; vice-president, Joshua Hunt; secretary, Charles Raedel; treasurer, A. U. Knisely; chorister, A. Waltz; executive committee, W. D. Meridith, A. J. Kintz, S. Harmon, M. D. The executive committee organized immediately by electing W. D. Meridith chairman, who,

by virtue of his office, becomes our corresponding secretary.

The Henry George land and labor club of this city and this society are on the most intimate and friendly relations. Some of our active members and officers are members of the Henry George club. We have been moving very cautiously and slowly, and now we think we will be able to report active work from this city and county (Stark).

A. E. KNISELY, Pres.  
CHARLES RAEDL, Sec.  
W. D. MERIDITH, Cor. Sec.

## ANTI-POVERTY IN PHILADELPHIA.

PHILADELPHIA, Feb. 27.—The usual weekly meeting of the anti-poverty society was held on Sunday evening, Feb. 26, Professor William Findlay occupying the chair.

John F. Halbach was the first speaker. He spoke of the necessity of avoiding ambiguity in the use of words and illustrated his proposition by the recent utterance of John Wanamaker denying the equality of men. What Mr. Wanamaker meant was that men are not equal in ability, stature, wealth or honor. But the equality asserted by the Declaration of Independence was an equality of right to opportunity; and this sort of equality he was sure Mr. Wanamaker would not deny.

"There is," said Mr. Halbach, "a true and a false conservatism and a true and a false radicalism. The true conservative is always radical and the true radical is only so because he is so conservative. The false conservative seeks only to preserve the forms of liberty, but the true radical would secure the substance and advance civilization to a still higher plane. This so-called conservatism is only a phase of conventionalism. It is not lightly or needlessly to be abandoned, but when it is opposed to justice and stands in the way of progress it is a crime, it is slavery, it is a selfish love of ease. All our blessed institutions were brought forth for us by the blood of radicals."

Mr. Chambers then gave an appropriate recitation, which was ably rendered and very enthusiastically received.

Mr. Hoar, who had suffered imprisonment for twelve months in Ireland for the cause of the land league there, was the next speaker. He was suffering from a severe cold, and in consequence was obliged to speak in a very low tone, so that his eloquent words were not heard at a distance from the stage. He said that there was really very little to be learned from America in foreign countries. The political parties here, he said, were no better here than in other countries, and until lately he had refrained from taking out his papers as a citizen because he could see no use in voting. One party was just like the other and both deeply steeped in corruption. He said the press was wrong when it said the united labor party had met its Waterloo last fall. That had really been a first campaign on our great platform. And a start with 75,000 voters was a far more magnificent beginning than any other reform or party ever had before.

He had often wondered why it was that some people's whole life was one continued night of martyrdom while to others existence was a continual holiday. They all came into the world equal and all left it equal. The poverty of to-day was the deadliest enemy of Christianity. "Progress and Poverty," he said, was the grandest book of the nineteenth century. Bradlaugh and Ingersoll find their strongest support in the teachings of current political economy.

Mr. Atkinson, the president of the society, then addressed the audience, but had scarcely begun his remarks when Henry George entered the hall and was greeted with an enthusiastic burst of applause and repeated calls. Mr. Atkinson courteously gave way to Mr. George, who spoke very briefly, drawing attention to the unexampled rapidity with which the anti-poverty doctrine is spreading, and urging the young men before him to accustom themselves to public speaking, that they might be able to aid the movement more efficiently. Mr. George invited questions from the audience, and was asked for some particulars of his recent western trip, which he gave, describing the advance of thought which he had noticed everywhere in his travels.

The meeting was then adjourned.

## The Tenth Ward United Labor Party.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.—Please announce that a special meeting of the Tenth ward association united labor party will be held at 855 Sackett street, near Smith street, on Thursday evening, March 1, at 8 p. m. sharp, to take action in regard to the refusal of the county committee to submit certain resolutions passed at the last meeting to the various ward associations for their consideration. As a full meeting is very desirable, members of the association are urged to attend.

ROBERT C. UTZES, Secretary.

## The Manistee Reform Club.

A club has been formed in Manistee, Michigan, for the purpose of discussing social questions. It is called the Manistee Reform Club, and it held its first meeting on the 21st inst. Mr. George Hilliker was elected president, Mr. T. B. Collins secretary, and Henry Brownrigg treasurer. The tariff and land questions were both vigorously discussed, and it was decided that the land question be the subject for debate at the next meeting.

## If More Capital Were Employed in New York Land Values Would Rise.

Boston Globe. "Boston, Philadelphia and Baltimore are competing most seriously with New York, and if we cannot get the same course, before we may discover too late that we have lost our crown and our treasure."

So said Charles Couderd to the New York real estate exchange a day or two ago. He was speaking in favor of Mayor Hewitt's proposition to place all taxes upon real estate and exempt personal property. Other real estate owners spoke forcibly in favor of the change. They believe that if personal property is exempted from taxation in New York capital will flow there in such quantities as to cause a rise of land values which will far more than offset the \$2,000,000 or so which would have to be added to the taxes on real estate.

Well, if the expectations of Mr. Couderd and the real estate men are realized, and New York begins to gain on Boston as a business center by reason of this change, Boston can, if she chooses, retain her present relative position by adopting the same course. If the exemption of personal property from taxation is a good thing for New York it is a good thing for Boston, and New York has no patent on it.

This is worth consideration from our real estate owners and business men. Let us have the largest possible prosperity for Boston, and not be behind New York in the adoption of modern improvements which may attract capital and business hither.

Kara Have They, but They Hear Not, Neither Will They Understand.

In speaking of pauperism, which drives men and women to be tramps and to become inmates of the almshouse, the reason given is that they are "stupid." The reason is not that they are stupid, but that they are "stupid" in the sense that they do not understand the value of anything but the "going up in value" of land. This kind of talk would do very well if he had established his theory on a sound principle, but it is an assumption, namely, that land is of intrinsic value, or even that anything has intrinsic value.

## A QUEER CASE.

Pre-empting Land in the Middle of Salt Lake City—A Practical Illustration of the Stealing of the Unearned Increment.

SALT LAKE CITY, Feb. 26.—Once in a while a community is so circumstanced that it clearly sees the injustice of the individual appropriation of land, even when such appropriation is effected in accordance with the law. There lies in the outskirts of this city a large tract of commons known as Arsenal hill, valued at about a quarter of a million dollars, and which has for many years been regarded as the common property of the people. On Tuesday morning last a number of men were found busy setting posts on the land preparatory to inclosing it with a barbed wire fence. It was soon discovered that one John H. Linck proposed to "jump" the land, as the people called it; and unmeasured indignation was aroused.

Marshal Solomon was soon on the ground, but the men paid no attention to his orders. Later in the day he returned with eight policemen, and the men refusing to quit work, the officers began to take up the posts while the men continued to plant them. The policemen not being over fond of work, thought it cheaper to arrest the men, which they did. In return Linck had the officers arrested on the charge of arresting without lawful process. The next morning several tents and a board shanty were found on the land. Near one of the tents a lady was busy cooking breakfast, and elsewhere a man had begun to improve the field with a plow, while a half dozen men were digging worm post holes.

By this time the indignation of the people had reached a white heat, and in response to the public ire the mayor summoned Marshal Solomon, Night Watchman Dobson, Recorder Wells and nearly the entire police force, with forty or fifty specials, and proceeded to the hill to oust the jumpers. They soon cleared the field of jumpers, tents and shanties, and continued to forcibly occupy it in the name of the people. The jumpers claim that the city had failed to comply with the law upon the authority of which alone any title must rest, and that therefore the land is open to settlement. And if their position can be sustained they have merely accepted the general invitation of the government of the United States, of which the people of Salt Lake are a component part, to "jump" any lands in its possession which are not reserved from settlement.

It is worthy of note that, while snarling under the fresh sting of the moral injustice of the individual appropriation of that particular piece of valuable land, the people of Salt Lake City are directing their indignation exclusively against the land jumpers, never once suspecting that the fault may be in the law and not in the human nature which prompts men to take advantage of any special privileges extended by the law.

The reason that the moral injustice of the jumping of this particular piece of land so sensibly prods the sleepy perceptions of our citizens is not to be found in the analysis of principles involved, but in the circumstances of time and value. Had this same land been "jumped" twenty or thirty years ago, the same value would have attached to it which it has now acquired without any one "owning" it, and from the same causes. But under those circumstances none of the present protestors would have dreamed of questioning the title or right of the jumper to the great unearned value of that land. The moral deductions would be something like these: "The settler obtained lawful ownership of the land at about the price which it was worth at that time; and the land being absolutely his property, any value which might subsequently attach to his land would be his, for how could he 'own' the land and some one else claim its accruing value? He bought or settled the land and took his chances, and it happened that Salt Lake City grew in population so as to give it a value of a quarter of a million dollars. He was a lucky dog, a shrewd fellow." Under these circumstances he would not be denounced as a land "thief" but honored as a "lord" and would be accorded the same consideration at the hands of the community, whom he had as effectually robbed as could be done by the most extreme case of land jumping imaginable. But the idea of an individual seizing that enormous unearned value at a single grab after it had accumulated to an extremely repulsive to the sense of justice of the Salt Laker.

Unquestionably the individual appropriation of Arsenal hill would be an unmitigated robbery of the people. But there is a much better way to right that wrong than by getting indignant and hiring special policemen to hold the fort. If the community were to levy a tax on all lands exclusive of improvements equal to its rental value, how much interest would the jumper of Arsenal hill have left? Only the value of the fence, tents and shanties. And since it was the land value they were after, and not the use of the land, they would drop the latter without the former like a hot potato. Or, at the worst, the city could resume possession of the hill by condemning it and compensating the "owners" for all the interest they have in it, viz: the fence and shanties. And the people would thus not only get the undisputed possession of the full unearned value of that land, but also of the enormous aggregate unearned value of all the lands within the city limits. They would be reveling in the enjoyment of an ample revenue to provide schools, public buildings, parks, libraries, good streets, electric lights, free public conveniences and many other desirable things, without depriving a single citizen of the fruits of his labor to the extent of a single penny.

JOHN SMITH.

## The Agitation in Toronto is Making People Philistines.

Phillips Thompson in Toronto Week.

Whatever may be the opinion of social conservatives as to the justice or the practicability of the land nationalization theory, it cannot be denied that the persistent and active propaganda of its advocates has done much to enlighten the public mind as to the fact which underlies it, of the enormous increase in land values, caused by the growth of population. As to this point at least there can be no room for controversy. Irrespective altogether of a question of justice, it may be held as to the effect of this increase upon the condition of the landless class, or the possibility of remedying social inequalities arising from this source, the discussion has emphasized and brought into prominence an important economic truth, the significance of which was formerly only appreciated by the learned few; to-day every intelligent newspaper reader is familiar with the doctrine of "unearned increment" and attention having been directed to the subject—finds it confirmed by the every day transactions of the real estate market.

Now, putting completely aside for the time what is distinctly known as the Henry George theory, and having regard only to the bare, universally admitted fact which the enunciation of that theory has brought out into strong relief, let us consider what bearing this fact ought to have, as viewed from an ordinary, common-sense, and common-sense standpoint, on the course of governments and other bodies holding valuable areas of land in trust for the public. This question has just now a practical interest for the people of Ontario, owing to the change of government, and the important public institutions, in-

cluding the parliament buildings, Upper Canada college and the lunatic asylum. Owing to the phenomenal growth of Toronto, their present locations have become at the same time enormously valuable and in some respects less suited to the purpose of the buildings. Their removal to suburban or less central sites will leave the provincial government in possession of several large blocks of land of great value, which are no longer required for public use. It is proposed in accordance with the policy hitherto followed in such cases to sell this land, and thereby increase the funds at the disposal of the government.

Years ago, before the rapid growth of cities had impressed the public with the advantage of the ownership of building land over every other form of investment, there might have been some excuse for such a course. While the future of Toronto was doubtful so long as this city had rivals, which it was possible might outstrip us in the race, the wisdom of holding, in the hope of a large future increase in value, large areas not required for public purposes might have been debatable. But that time has long passed. It is as certain as any thing human can be that Toronto will continue to expand, and that consequently the value of central land and localities will advance by leaps and bounds. Should the provincial government now dispose of the sites of the present parliament buildings, Upper Canada college and lunatic asylum they will give private individuals the opportunity of making fortunes out of the increase in value sure to increase within a few years. They will be deliberately throwing away an advantage which the public would be hard to get back. So as unearned, orthodox doctrines of political economy, ought to belong to the public as present possessors by valid title. They will be acting as a prudent, far seeing man would act in conducting his personal affairs. The members of the government of ready money could all excuse the folly either of the private investor or the holder of such property in trust for the public who would be guilty of allowing considerations of slight temporary advantage to outweigh the duty of jealousy concerning it as the source of a large future revenue. But if we may believe the repeated statements of successive provincial treasurers, the government is in no immediate need of money. Even if they were that credit is good, and an increase in investment on Toronto real estate augments more rapidly than interest at a moderate rate, it would be sound economy to borrow rather than to alienate these valuable sites.

## How the Tariff Works in Michigan.

Detroit News. The movement started at Grand Rapids among the furniture manufacturers for free raw materials is spreading among other manufacturers in Michigan. Even the lumber mill men are beginning to wake up, as shown by a meeting of the Michigan Manufacturers' Association, to Congressmen Fisher, urging the removal of the duty from lumber and of the export duty from logs. The truth is that there is scarcely a manufacturer of any sort in the state of Michigan who does not pay much more in tariff on his materials and machinery than he gets back in the tariff on his finished product. This would not seem to be the case in the lumber mills, as the pine land owners are fond of boasting that there is no tariff on the raw logs; but the fact is, nevertheless, that there is no class of raw material off which so much is secured by tariff for its producers as logs. The pine lands are in so few hands that each mill is practically dependent on one man, or combination of a few men, who own all the timber on the stream upon which it is located. Logs cannot be brought from Canada on account of the Canadian export tax, which is a retaliation for the duties on the lumber. The land owners have the millers at their mercy, and do what they will to economize in manufacture, the millers find that the timber owners can make them pay for logs all but barely enough to keep their mills going. If the price of lumber goes up, the price of logs goes up to meet it. If a new saw is invented which saves ten per cent or more in the cost of manufacture, the timber owner puts up his prices and absorbs that ten per cent. The saw miller, who is the one man, or owners of the mines absorb the whole benefit of the tariff. Aside from the owners of mining lands and timber lands, and a few special manufacturers which have been organized into trusts to protect themselves against the owners of the raw materials, manufacturers derive no benefit from the tariff. If the tariff was taken off lumber, the Canadian export duty off logs, wool, iron ore and pig iron upon the free list, and the chemicals, machinery, manufactures our manufacturers would immediately find themselves, in all but a very few instances able to compete with foreign producers, and the whole fabric of tariff protection would quickly collapse, as it did in England when corn was made free.

## How Are the Mighty Fallen?

Cork, (Ireland) Eagle.

"Once the landlord was the owner of a landed estate; now he is merely a partner in an agricultural firm, with no control or voice in its management." So says a deputation of Irish landlords to Lord Salisbury on Friday last, the 3d inst. It would be hard to hit upon a more apt epitome of the present position of the landlords than this. It is a condition, it is clear, it is unmistakably true. In word, it is the whole state of the question in a nutshell. For the landlords it is a confession of defeat; a melancholy termination of their once great power; a confession that their power is now only a sleeping partner in the "agricultural firm." They are not too anxious to retain the title, for them, anomalous position; they are rather desirous, as a speaker said at the landlords' convention, held in Dublin last summer, to run their farms, to turn their backs to some safe harbor of refuge to save the cargo. To save the vessel they have no hopes. The majority of them probably never thought that matters would come to this pass; that their power in the land would have vanished almost entirely away. They who once were all important; who controlled parliamentary representation, grand juries, town councils and boards of guardians; who held the fortunes and the very lives of their tenants in their hands; who, in fact, possessed the patronage for all important posts in the country, from the highest in Dublin castle down to the workhouse schoolmaster, and who took a third of their net rental is taken from them by the very government whose sway over Ireland the landlords have been the main props in maintaining. What wonder is it that they are dispirited and downhearted to the verge of despair?

## THE STANDARD.

HENRY GEORGE, Editor and Proprietor.

Published weekly at 25 ANN STREET, NEW YORK.

TERMS, POSTAGE FREE.

One year, \$2.50; six months, \$1.25; single copies, 5 cents.

Entered at the postoffice, New York, as second class matter.

Communications and contributions are invited, and will be attentively considered. Manuscripts not found suitable for publication will be returned if sufficient stamps are sent. No notice will be taken of anonymous communications.

Contributions and letters on editorial matters should be addressed to THE EDITOR OF THE STANDARD, and all communications on business to the PUBLISHER OF THE STANDARD.

THE STANDARD wants an agent to secure subscribers at every postoffice in the United States, to whom liberal terms will be given.

THE STANDARD is for sale by newsdealers throughout the United States. Persons who may be unable to obtain it will confer a favor on the publisher by notifying him promptly.



## ANTI-POVERTY.

## DR. GOTTHEIL PRESIDES AT THE FORTY-FOURTH PUBLIC MEETING.

A Powerful Oration by Dr. McGlynn—The Anti-Poverty Society Should Copy the Methods of the Anti-Slavery Society and Work with the "Solid Men" that will Do Most for the Advancement of their Principles—Better Work with Unthinking Instruments than Not to Work at All—An Appeal for Maintaining the United Labor Party.

At the forty-fourth public meeting of the anti-poverty society, held in the Academy of Music last Sunday evening, Dr. Gottheil, the son of the well-known rabbi, presided. He said that when the anti-poverty society was first founded he was afraid that its platform would be no place for him, but he was glad to find that its foundations were laid so deeply that Jew and gentile, religious and agnostic were equally admissible. Based on no creed, it appeals to all creeds. It was for the cause of humanity, and its members must go straight on, no matter who might fall or fail by the wayside. Compromise might be well for political associations, but it had no place in the anti-poverty society. Not until justice had been established would its work be done. Dr. Gottheil introduced Dr. McGlynn as the orator of the evening.

Dr. McGlynn in beginning his address disclaimed any special power of oratory and said that he always felt diffident on rising to address any audience. He felt more than usually diffident on this occasion because he was more than usually unprepared. It was a meeting of the anti-poverty society, and therefore the doctrines of that society should be expounded at every meeting. A newspaper man had spoken of the "old lady or gag of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man." In doing this he had been guilty of a blasphemy and an outrage against his own manhood and should ask pardon of the almighty Father for his unchristian utterance.

Dr. McGlynn went on to expound the doctrine of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, and the consequent equal rights of all men to work out their destiny, which involved their equal rights to maintain life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness by their own labor. From this he deduced the equal rights of all to the common, general bounties of nature; that is, their equal right of access to them, so that their diverse talents and industry would not be hampered and all men reduced to a dead level. The idea that all men should be brought to such a level was no part of the teachings of the anti-poverty society, although it was frequently so misrepresented, even by men who spoke in the name of religion. He gave some of them credit for sincerity in such misrepresentation, however, saying that they denounced the society because they wanted to make good the teaching of God's commandment, "Thou shalt not steal." But they were wrong. So far from wishing to promote stealing, the anti-poverty society wanted to stop the stealing.

This stealing occurred through the appropriation by individuals of the unearned increment of increasing value of land which accrued from the growth of the community. This value belonged to the community and should be taken by the community by a rental value tax. This system would unlock opportunities now monopolized by the few and would make possible a civilization grander than any of which the world had yet dreamed. This was the mission of the anti-poverty society and its twin sister, the united labor party. Dr. McGlynn continued:

This wrong must be undone by political action. We contemplate only a peaceful change of law. There is almost precisely the same relation between the anti-poverty society and the united labor party as between the anti-slavery society and the republican party. (Applause.) The anti-slavery society gave the thought and impulse that helped to make the republican party that, battling slavery, while acknowledging its inability to interfere with it where it was entrenched in the institutions of sovereign states, was determined to do everything to make that horrible institution odious, to restrict it as much as possible, to forbid it wherever by the constitution of the United States it could be forbidden by congress. And so they waged war against slavery in the territories and in the District of Columbia; and that party, by the providence of God and through the folly of the slave owners themselves, was able to bring about the emancipation of the slaves in a few years' time, when even the most sanguine of the founders of the party and of the anti-slavery society could hardly have dared to hope for any such thing in a century.

It is only by imitating the magnificent bravery of the anti-slavery men and of the founders of the republican party that we can hope for a victory at all. (Applause.) A most magnificent means of preaching our doctrine is the availing ourselves of every political campaign whether in the city or the state or the nation, by the holding of conventions, by the adoption of a platform, by the nomination of a ticket, to give excuse and occasion to our speakers to go through the city, through the state, or through the country, getting a hearing that under other circumstances would be idle for us to hope for. (Great applause.)

Now if I, as a friendly member of the united labor party, am permitted to give a word of advice to that party, it is that it should go straight ahead, doing its appointed work, never disbanding, never interrupting its labors, until having fought every campaign in city, state and nation, it shall have accomplished a perfect victory by writing its doctrines in every statute book, whether of the state or of the nation, and seating its congressmen and its legislators, and its president in the chair of Washington. (Applause.)

We have heard the sentiment expressed somewhere that it doesn't matter how people vote but it does matter how they think. (Applause.) Now suppose we all think that it would be well to make a tunnel through the Palisades over there in New Jersey, and let us all keep thinking and get all the people of New Jersey and all the people of New York to devote the undivided attention of their intellects to thinking that there ought to be a tunnel right through a certain point in the Palisades; I want to know how much of that combined intelligent thinking of all the people of New Jersey and New York will bore that tunnel through the Palisades? (Laughter and applause.) But if somehow or other you can get a gang of men there with machines and get them to work on that spot of the Palisades, although they do not think at all, although they don't know what a hole through that mountain is dug for, that hole will be dug. (Applause.)

So I cheerfully admit, my friends, that thinking is a good thing, and that thinking leads to doing. But in a matter of political reform I cannot for the life of me see what good the thinking is going to do unless that thought shall be carried into practice. And on the other hand I do believe that the vote of a man who does not think at all, who takes

his opinion on faith because he knows you are a wise man and you advise him to vote so for the best interests of his country, if he does not take his principles on faith, his vote is just as effectual in that direction as the vote of the greatest philosopher the world has ever seen. (Applause.) And if the philosopher should happen to stay at home that day because the weather was rainy, the man, not being a philosopher, not doing much thinking, but who would go and vote, would help the cause more as far as voting goes, than the philosopher. And practical reform never would be helped at all except by voting.

Now, then, I would advise the united labor party not to disband their party after a campaign or two to take a rest for a year or two. (Applause.) It would have been a funny kind of a way to put down the rebellion if, when our armies were in the face of the enemy after a reverse or two, President Lincoln had said "You had better go home and take a rest." This putting down the rebellion does not seem to be very successful so far. In a year or two we will call you together again and we will have another whack at putting down the rebellion. (Great applause and laughter.) You could never have got those men together again; never, never.

The party should go straight on. Such was the unanimous feeling of all those men who started to establish this party. Such was the plan of those who adopted the Syracuse platform. It was their clear intent that a conference should be called for the purpose of forming a national party to take active part in the presidential contest. Some have since taken the view that we had better not go into the national campaign, except by making prominent some other issue, that the fundamental doctrine of the platform was really a national issue at all. But the Syracuse platform was composed largely in view of a national campaign. It was full of national issues.

There is a demand for a postal telegraph. Who was to establish this postal telegraph? The same power that owns and controls the post office. There was a demand concerning the currency (applause) and one aimed at the abolition of the national banks. If that is not a national issue I don't know what a national issue is. We want government ownership and control of railroads. The United States ought to own and control certain railroads that it has actually built—(applause)—the great Pacific railroads and others.

To come to our fundamental principle, the doctrine of the land for the people. (Applause.) Has that doctrine nothing to do with national politics? Let us look a moment. See how large a portion of the United States is still occupied by the so-called territories. These territories are subject to the congress of the United States, our servant. We the people have a right to demand that congress shall enact such laws for the government of these territories as they know to be just. There is the District of Columbia, subject to the despotic power of congress. We have a right to demand that those wards of the nation shall not be robbed by land grabbers. (Applause.)

Congress should to-morrow make laws that all taxes in those territories and in the District of Columbia should be levied upon land, that the full rental value of the land should be appropriated in the shape of a rental tax and paid into the local treasuries. (Applause.) I said on another platform that this rental tax should be paid either into the United States treasury, or, better still, into the local treasuries. Through the unfortunate inaccuracy of reporters the latter portion of my remark was not reported. And so some wiseacre writes a letter to say that Dr. McGlynn wants to make the United States the universal landlord. It does occur to me that between our own government, or an English syndicate, or private individuals in New York city, I would cast my vote for the government as landlord every time. (Applause.) But the latter part of my phrase is what I would adhere to and insist upon. I would only accept the landlordship of the United States government as the lesser of two evils. But the proper thing, in keeping with this platform, would be to appropriate by law of congress to the local treasuries of these territories the full rental value of those lands. Is not that a national question?

That is not all. Does not our government now hold as trustee for the whole people an immense national domain in all the states and territories? There are still hundreds of millions of acres actually the property of the United States government. Could we not with perfect propriety demand that our government shall never again violate that law of God, "The land shall not be sold forever," and demand that congress shall never again sell or give away a single square foot of land, but that it shall under wise regulations, precisely similar to the existing homestead laws, permit the occupation for use of these lands in proper quantities, say 100 acres, with the understanding that the occupants shall enjoy it for their use, perpetual, undisturbed possession, and that they shall never be taxed upon any of their improvements, on the simple condition that when with the growth of the community a rental value shall accrue to those lands they shall pay such rental value in the shape of a tax into their respective local treasuries?

In that way we could through our national government actually introduce this great reform in a short time into all the territories of the United States, that with the rapid increase of population in a few years be mighty states of this union. And that is not all. By the force of example we can accelerate enormously the bringing about of this platform in all of our states because of the potency of the example of what is done on national land. We have a most comforting example in the republican party, the abolition movement, the anti-slavery society, who while acknowledging that they could not interfere with slavery in the states were determined to give the institution no rest, by constantly petitioning congress to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, and its prohibition in the territories of the United States (applause). In order to preach our doctrine effectually we must practice it as well as preach. Let us preach as much as we can, but let us do all we can to encourage our brethren of the united labor party in carrying out their magnificent campaign whenever opportunity offers.

**The Way to Bore a Tunnel is to Bore It.**  
JERSEY CITY, N. J.—I attended the meeting of the anti-poverty society at the Academy of Music last Sunday and listened carefully to Dr. McGlynn's address. One point he made struck me very forcibly. It was that the way to bore a tunnel through the palisades would be to go to work and bore it; and that it would make much difference whether the men who did the digging knew the object of their work or not, so long as they dug in the right direction.

This was a very strong illustration, but it seems to me that Dr. McGlynn hardly said its full meaning. We are trying to dig a tunnel through the palisades of moral and economic ignorance to the pleasant country of emancipation beyond. Now, if there are several millions of democratic laborers standing ready to use shovel and drill in hand, ready to go to work tunneling in our direction, why in the name of common sense should we try to prevent them? If the democracy will drive our tunnel through the hard

rock of protection, we may find easier boring farther on. At all events we shall be better off than we are now. J. LOEFFNER.

## THE NEW CRUSADE IN ULSTER.

BELLAGHY, County Derry, Ireland.—You will be glad to hear that the gospel of the new crusade is making progress in Ireland, and is finding ardent advocates among the men of Ulster. John Ferguson of Glasgow, the sturdy son of a sturdy Antrim Presbyterian, has been preaching the crusade in the northern counties during the past few weeks with marked eloquence and success. He addressed a meeting of rank Orangemen in Portadown, and carried his audience so thoroughly with him that he received a vote of thanks for his address—the warmest and most enthusiastic, he affirms, he ever received in his life. On February 10 he addressed a meeting in the Temple of Liberty at Toome, at which the following resolution was proposed and seconded by two farmers, and adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That we emphatically protest against the tendency of late land legislation to barter away the unalienable birthright of the people, and we unanimously assert that no settlement of the question can be satisfactory or final that admits the unjust principle of private property in land.

Mr. Ferguson's address was a masterpiece of logic and eloquence, and he succeeded admirably in demonstrating the inherent injustice of private property in land. Mr. Richard McGhee of Glasgow also addressed the meeting, and pointed out the way labor was robbed by rents and royalties. He quoted statistics to show how much the landlord receives from a trans-Atlantic steamship company as royalty for coal in one voyage of the Umbria or Etruria, as also statistics showing how much the landlord mulets the workers in an iron foundry per week for royalties on coal and iron ore. Mr. McGhee's figures produced a powerful effect. Mr. John Dudley (Belfast), in a practical address, exposed the utter fallacy of the belief that land nationalization is impracticable. The Belfast Morning News gave a five-column report of the meeting and the Freeman gave part of Mr. Ferguson's address, but suppressed the resolution.

The new crusade is undoubtedly making much progress in Ulster, and it only requires education for the people to grasp its full significance. If any of your readers who do not preserve THE STANDARD would mail it to the editor, I should take much pleasure in "spreading the light" by circulating it in this district. JOSEPH DAVISON.

## The Henry George Assembly of Detroit.

The second public meeting of the Henry George assembly of Detroit was held Feb. 20, at James Phelan in the chair. Mr. Henry A. Robinson was the chief speaker. Among other good things he said that the Malthusian theory of population as a cause of poverty had been exploded. Capitalism, he said, is a landlording watch labor's life line, and wages are doled out accordingly. That class living the cheapest—economizing the most—regulates the wages of all others; for all must come down to that rate or starve. It is not over-production, or extravagance, or intemperance or over-population, then, that causes the galling poverty visible on every hand. "The cause of poverty is landlording," thundered the speaker, and this climax to his argument brought a storm of applause.

After scoring Statisticians Atkinson on his soup bones and rinds and his corn and hog and "protein," Mr. Robinson showed that the people got the entire proceeds of their labor there would be no general poverty. For poverty is the result of robbery under forms of the law, which uphold and perpetuate a monopoly that makes the land owner the master and the tenant the slave. "Such a thing as exclusive proprietorship in the earth, any more than in the air or the water, was never contemplated by the Divine Being who gave us life."

The next public meeting will be held March 6.

## Anti-Poverty in Baltimore.

BALTIMORE, Feb. 27.—Our anti-poverty society held its regular weekly meeting in Rame's hall, on Sunday, Feb. 26. A good audience was present.

Mr. W. T. Gorsuch of New York, was the first speaker. He gave a clear demonstration of the principle upon which the society is founded, and spoke approvingly of the recent utterances of President Cleveland on the tariff, and of Mayor Hewitt on taxation.

Mr. W. J. Ogden of Baltimore also spoke, showing the progress and doctrine of the society among people who adopt them consciously and unconsciously. He referred to a local question now agitating Baltimore—the annexation of the lands surrounding the city, a measure which is opposed by speculating land owners, whose taxes would be increased if the "belt" were taken into the city. He showed how the value of the land in the "belt" has been created by the people of Baltimore, and justly belongs to those who brought it into being.

Mrs. Margaret Moore of New York, is expected to address the society at its next meeting.

We have received a circular signed by Mr. S. W. Williams of Vincennes, Ind., asking opinions with reference to calling a national conference (not convention), to be held in the west or south. The matter will be discussed at our weekly meeting on Wednesday.

W. N. HILL, M. D.

## Good Reading for Jeffersonian Democrats.

Jefferson's Writings, vol. 7, p. 210.

That our Creator made the earth for the use of the living and not of the dead; that those who do not live have no right in it, no authority or power over it; that one generation of men cannot foreclose or encumber the use of another, which comes to it in its own right and by the same divine beneficence; that a preceding generation cannot bind a succeeding one by its laws or contracts; these deriving their obligation from the will of the existing majority, and that majority being removed by death another comes in its place with a will equally free to make its own laws and contracts; these are axioms so self-evident that no explanation can make them plainer; for he who does not reason with who says that no existence can control existence, or that nothing can move something. They are axioms also pregnant with salutary consequences.

THOMAS JEFFERSON.

Monticello, Sept. 24, 1823.

## Farmers Who Demand the Right to Buy in the Cheapest Market.

At a recent meeting of the Minnesota state farmers' alliance in St. Paul the following resolution was adopted:

We demand the revision of the present iniquitous tariff, and ask our Minnesota delegates in Washington to use their utmost endeavors to have placed upon the free list lumber, iron, salt, wool, coal, and all articles for which "trusses" have been or may hereafter be formed, as the producers of the northwest are forced to sell their products in competition with the producers of the Old World. They ask also to be allowed to purchase in the nearest markets without paying this no longer necessary tribute to our own government.

## UNITY CONGREGATION.

## CHRISTIANITY AS OPPOSED TO MODERN CIVILIZATION.

A Discourse by Hugh O. Pentecost on The Golden Rule—The Obstacles Which Our Civilization Presents to its Observance.

Hugh O. Pentecost's sermon of last Sunday was devoted to the consideration of the direct teachings of Christ in their applicability to modern human society, and the pointing out of the artificial obstacles which our civilization interposes to any complete obedience to the golden rule.

It is my opinion, said Mr. Pentecost, that even as things are, the teachings of Jesus are far more easily followed than we commonly suppose.

In my opinion, said the young boy or girl free, or rather never to arrest them at all, after the commission of a crime, but to habitually treat them with kindness—to make this the habit of the community just as it is now our habit to be especially considerate toward the blind, the lame or the deformed—would be far better and safer than to send them, as we do, to the house of correction, where they are immediately thrown with more hardened offenders and confined in a moral atmosphere in which the highest virtue is to become skillful in crimes, bitterness being all the time engendered in their hearts toward the society which incarcerates them.

Not long ago a burglar was brought before a New Jersey judge and sentenced to prison for the second time. "Now," said the judge, "my advice to you is to go to prison and serve out this sentence, and during it make up your mind that when you come forth into the world again you will be an honest man."

"Yes, judge," said the prisoner, "that is very good advice; but when I was in the prison before, I was taught to make shoes, a large portion of the soles of which were pasted on, and the contractor who is getting rich out of this business of selling pastebored leather is a prominent Christian. I don't think you'll ever make me an honest man in that prison."

Now which would be better—to imprison that man under the circumstances related or to send him away with the assurance that society loves him rather than hates him? A few years ago in New York a young man was discovered in petty thefts from his employer. He was thrown into prison. Before he was brought to trial his Christian employer was induced to withdraw the charge against him, but only after such long and persistent persuasion that all the moral effect of the pardon was lost. The young man came forth from jail disgraced and went west to begin life anew, his family being heartbroken and shamed in his shame. They were among the best of people. Here was punishment tempered with what would ordinarily be called mercy.

About the same time a young man of whom I know stole money from his employer and absconded. The employer alone knew of the theft and told no one, making a plausible excuse for the absence of his clerk, meantime searching for him until he discovered his whereabouts. He then wrote to him, making no reference whatever to his crime, but saying that when his vacation was over he would be glad to see him back at his desk. The young man understood his employer, went back to work, was greeted as usual, no allusion whatever being made to what had happened, and today is in a place of trust and responsibility from which he has risen on account of his superior talents and fidelity.

Both these instances are facts. Which illustrates the highest principle and the best policy?

I know it will be said such an instance as the last would only be true if the thief was of a comparatively fine nature. This, however, is pure assumption. I think that the secret of success in such cases lies in the genuine goodness and tact displayed by the thief's employer.

Will you say that the bishop in "Les Miserables" who, instead of punishing the thief whom he had kindly entertained and who rewarded his hospitality by stealing his silver candlestick, calmly said to him, when arrested and brought before him: "You forgot to take the plates which I also gave you," was not right in the highest sense of the term? I think the effect of that action in making Jean Valjean one of the best of men would be the result ordinarily in actual life as it was in the story.

Whenever we do, as if by accident, put the teachings of Jesus into practice we find that the work quite as well as our policy of selfishness and vengeance.

It is commonly said, and by great and good men, that progress depends upon the exact reverse of these maxims; that our present glorious civilization has been built up by force; that we should not be as far advanced in all that is called Christianity but that we have forced men to do right. If that is true, then the British officer who calmly proposed as a measure economical, expedient, and, in the end, calculated to permit the loss of the fittest souls, the subjugation of India to Christianity, the cannon's mouth, was right. Then Mohammed was wrong in nothing except that he forced men to believe in the wrong religion. Then the inquisition was right in torturing men for the good of their own souls and killing them for the good of others. Then we have made a mistake in abolishing capital punishment for nineteen of the twenty crimes for which it was once inflicted.

Now, I deny this common assertion that it is necessary to do wrong that good may come; that true civilization is built upon force; that the only way we can make men truly the imitators of the high life of Jesus and Buddha and Socrates is to begin by violating their teaching.

And I assert that the only characteristics of our civilization which are truly beneficent have been evolved by the teaching and effort of men who hate this damnable doctrine of salvation by gun powder, steel and blood.

I assert that the monstrous curses of the human race today, the land monopoly, the foundation of our riches, the approach of every other heinous monopoly of wealth and opportunity; national debts and burdensome systems of taxation, are the direct results of the use of force in establishing and maintaining society.

And these fruits of force are the causes of pauperisms and prisons, poverty and crime. There are those who point to Germany as in the van of civilization. And in scholarship she is. But in so far as Germany reflects the thinking and purposing of that devout Christian and abolitionist, Frederick Bismarck, she is a scandal upon the name of civilization. A nation that turns women and old men and children into producers for the support of its army, and turns itself into a military camp in that particular, barbarous, not civilized.

There are those who speak of English civilization, but except in the realm of letters, science and art there is no such thing. A nation that never hesitated to do wrong if it could accomplish it by force and never was known to do right except at the mandate of force, a nation that forced opium upon China to build up her trade, and forces degradation and death upon Ireland to increase her rent

roll, represents a barbarism far more terrible in its effects than that of the jungles of Africa. We might not have built up precisely the same sort of civilization that we have if we had always followed the precepts of Jesus Christ. We undoubtedly should not. We should have built with the idea that men are more important than property; at present we are proceeding entirely upon the supposition that property is a more sacred possession than life.

At present a cow that can be bought for \$30 is more valuable in the sight of the law and in the sentiment of Christian people than a man, as is shown by the fact that he who kills another in the act of stealing his cow will go by common consent unpunished; and that a horse is more valuable than a man is shown conclusively wherever you find horses and men employed by the same concern. More valuable? Why not? A horse costs \$150; when one drops in his tracks it costs that much to replace him. But if a man drops in his tracks another is ready to take his place at no cost, though he knows that he, too, will soon drop in his tracks.

You were troubled with draft riots in New York in '63, and all the "solid men" in the community were with the government against the rioters. What produced these riots? The people saw that when the government was in need of men it did not hesitate to go into the poor man's home and take out the bread winner; but when the government was in need of money it very considerably agreed that the poor people who were left after the war should pay to the rich a dollar, beside interest at 10 percent. Supposing the government had drafted money when it all the "solid men" have been as patriotic as they were? And yet why did the government not do so? Because the glorious civilization we have reared by violating the precepts of him after whom we have named it, is one which makes money more sacred than men.

It is strange how long it takes us to see what evil results always follow this false practice of government by force and how good the results of the right conduct are.

I never heard parents beside the dead form of a child repeat of at their patient's death, "I have no more to say to you, but I have heard them express shame and regret for using the rod."

Some years ago the murderer of Jim Fisk was tried for the crime and sent to prison for a year or two. Now he is a prominent man in society in some respects. Would it have been better to have hanged him? Would it not have been better to have done nothing to him since what we did has sent him forth, what would be called in theology, "justified." His crimes are "atoned" for. . . . There is, however, a real difficulty in putting into practice the charitable precepts of Christ. "If a man takes your overcoat give him your undercoat." "Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away." "Lend hoping not to receive again." These precepts are difficult to follow because nothing is more certain than that he who puts them into practice is a kind of criminal, since the certain effect of indiscriminate charity is to pauperize the community and reduce wages. It is absolutely certain that the hundreds of thousands of dollars which are poured into New York through her two hundred charitable societies does more harm than good.

Here is the point at which we run against a snag in the teaching of Christ, and it brings us face to face with the question: Is he wrong, or are we wrong? I do not hesitate to say we are wrong. Any social system which makes it desirable for a man to become a criminal is wrong. And this our system does. We are rapidly approaching the time when it will be desirable either to be very rich or to be in prison—that is to say, to be a criminal; for it will soon be true that a man can neither be very rich or get into prison without becoming a criminal. The road to wealth is already practically closed against conscientious men, and it is repeatedly found necessary nowadays to refuse entrance to prisons to honest workmen who apply for the privilege of going.

Only a short time ago a man in Danbury, Conn., was forcibly ejected from a police court because he insisted upon going to jail, whereupon he went into the street and threw a stone through a show window, and so succeeded in his quest after being forced to become a criminal.

This is because, as the Christian Union says, it is now demonstrable that society provides more bountifully for its criminals and treats them better in every way than if they were honest mechanics.

The spectacle of Austin Corbin giving \$20,000 in charity to the families of the suffering miners, after having refused to arbitrate with them for the purpose of deciding upon a fair scale of wages, is an instructive picture of society in relation to the workableness of the golden rule. This is the doing of you would be done by. No man wishes to be deprived of the opportunity of earning a living and then pauperized by charity for the glorification of pharisees.

The golden rule is not workable now in the industrial world and never will be so long as we keep on in our present "devil-take-the-hindmost" policy. But when we become wise and just enough to see how much better it is to use our land for the sustenance of human life than to feed financial greed; to use our railroads and telegraphs and coal mines and oil wells to minister to the needs of all the people rather than to the superfluities of a few; when we become wise enough to arrange society upon a just basis, it will be no longer necessary for Christian ministers to tell us that we should worship Jesus but pay no attention to his vagaries; it will be possible for us then to read the sermon on the mount and find some practical sense in it; we may then largely abate our punishments, for when men can easily earn a living they do not care to steal; and when they are debauched by neither poverty nor riches they are not so fond of murder and other crimes. We can then declare to men a beneficent God and hope that they will believe us; we can then point to the sayings of Jesus and say: "Behold, how true they are!"

**From the United Labor Party of Dunkirk.**  
DUNKIRK, N. Y.—At a meeting of the members of the united labor party of this city, held this day, the following resolution was adopted, the same having been drafted by Messrs. F. Lake and M. J. Smith, who were appointed at a previous meeting for that purpose:

Whereas, Certain members of the executive committee of the united labor party have declared their intention to call a convention for the purpose of nominating candidates for president and vice-president in the approaching national campaign; and this course being in the judgment of our teacher, Henry George, and others of our trusted leaders detrimental to the best interests of the party, and a stumbling block in the way of the advancement of our principles and the accomplishment of our purposes, which are the abolition of our present system of national and state taxation and the substitution thereof of a single tax on land values; therefore,

Resolved, That we, the members of the united labor party of Dunkirk, deem the

action of those members of the executive committee worthy of censure, and demand the calling of a conference as provided for by the Syracuse convention; and be it further Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to the editor of THE STANDARD and the secretary of the executive committee of the united labor party.

GEORGE H. SIMMONS, Chairman.

JOHN J. LIPPITT, Secretary.

## THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

They Advise the County General Committee to Condemn any Attempt to Commit the Party in Advance.

The county executive committee, united labor party, at a meeting held Feb. 27, voted to recommend to the county general committee the passage of the following preamble and resolutions:

Whereas, Certain individuals in advance of the coming of a national conference have endeavored to commit the party to certain policies and privileges; therefore be it Resolved, That the county general committee of the united labor party, believing firmly in the principles enunciated in the Syracuse platform and their logical deductions to be embodied in a national platform, do most emphatically condemn any premature decision as to candidates, principles or policies in advance of the meeting of the only body that can authoritatively deal with them—a national conference; and be it further

Resolved, That we most emphatically condemn, no matter by whom made, any attempt to sidetrack the united labor party, or make it the mere cat's paw of either the democratic or republican party, as we believe them both to be wholly corrupt and incapable of effecting any reformation in existing social and political evils, until, through defeat, they are compelled to adopt the only principles that by removing the burden of taxation from the products of labor will secure to all their unalienable rights to the soil, and the full enjoyment of the products of their labor.

## A Vote Explained.

New York, Feb. 27.—It may not be inopportune at this time for one who voted in favor of "exclusive and unswerving support of the fundamental reforms set forth in the Syracuse platform" at the first meeting of the county general committee of this city, to define what I understood the above to mean. The sinister purpose of those who introduced the resolution can not detract in my mind from the excellent effect it may be made to serve. As I understand it, all the "fundamental reforms" are summed up in the abolition of all taxes but one, and I regarded the resolution as a timely notice to the democratic machine that tinkering in place of reform could not deceive or divert us. As we read in the resolution an assurance to those who, without thinking, might conclude that a small installment of reform would pacify the party's clamor for the full measure, that nothing short of the whole earth in this respect would satisfy us, and that no matter what the measure of their sincerity the tinkers could not reckon upon their usual arts in staying the progress of our movement.

Those who see the worse than uselessness of entering a national campaign on state issues need not fear that their vote in the county committee committed them to any concession to the ideas of those who care more for party than principle. In my devotion to the latter I trust I may, without egotism, claim to be as sincere as any member of the committee, while as to the former it can only command my adherence by eschewing the machine and fulfilling the purpose for which it was called into existence.

ROBERT IRELAND.

1006 Third avenue.

## A Friend's Word of Cheer.

New York.—As one who has followed the single tax movement with the keenest interest ever since its commencement in 1886, I feel impelled, on the present occasion, to send you a few words of good cheer and to thank you for your steadfast adherence to principle. In doing this I am sure that I express the feelings of this large portion of the readers, on whom your writings are exercising so powerful an influence and who, like myself, must have a feeling of gratitude and pride to find that you do not weary when a stand has to be taken for principle as against policy.

It was well to avoid the disgraceful spectacle of rival anti-poverty societies. As regards yourself, you can well afford to withdraw from politics. As a recent letter in THE STANDARD from Mr. Garrison very well expressed it, your work is that of the reformer, and it seems to me that you have reason to be satisfied with the influence which you are exercising upon the thoughts of your people. To emphasize my feelings, I enclose \$100 for the recruiting fund.

A. B. C.

## The Single Tax Club of Brooklyn.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.—At the last meeting of the Henry George land reform club of South Brooklyn it was decided to change the name of the organization to the Single Tax club. The intention of this change is simply to make the object for which the club exists more manifest. The club was organized in January and has already made such progress in membership as to warrant its removal at an early date to larger and more attractive quarters. Meetings are held every Tuesday and Friday evenings at the club rooms, at 533 Sackett street, and visitors of every party and of every shade of economic opinion are heartily welcome. The present membership is about fifty.

HOUSE COMMITTEE.

## From the Canton, Ohio, Club.

CANTON, Ohio.—The following resolutions were adopted at the last meeting of the Henry George club of this place:

Resolved, That, for what seems to us good and sufficient reasons, we, at present, deem the nomination of a candidate for president on the "single tax" platform, imprudent and inexpedient.



# QUERIES AND ANSWERS.

## Who Pays the Single Tax?

LONDON, Ontario, Can.—(1) Granted that your single tax law is enforced, the rent being appropriated by the state, would not every commodity produced directly or indirectly from the land carry a portion of the tax with it? Where, then, is the reason in saying that all commodities which are the product of human effort should be exempt from taxation?

(2) Or, putting the question in another shape, a criticism of the following statements would shed light on the darkness: Justice to each and all only demands two conditions, viz., (a) that the tax should be constant—that is, levied without any possibility of change, and (b) that it cannot be evaded by any portion of the community. These conditions being fulfilled, it does not matter whether or not the tax is imposed on land or on the products of human exertion, speculation and monopoly in land not being considered.

INQUIRY.—(1) No. A commodity produced from valuable land is worth no more in the same market than a commodity produced from land having no value. Here, let us say, is a piece of land, the best to be had for nothing, which with a given expenditure of labor and capital will produce 20 of any given commodity; and here is another piece which with the same expenditure of capital and labor will produce 50. Eliminating, for simplicity, the cost of exchange, the rent of the latter piece of land will be 30 and one commodity will be of the same value in the same market as the other. If, now, you take the rent (30) by taxation, how can the value of the commodity carry a portion of the tax with it? If a higher price is asked for the commodity produced on the valuable land which has paid a tax, than for that produced on the non-valuable land, there will be no sale for it. A tax on rent cannot be added to the price of the product.

(2) A tax on products of human exertion will not fulfill the conditions. (a) A tax on a product is not constant; by adding to the cost of production it increases the price and is shifted to the consumer. (b) It may be evaded, as such taxes constantly are, e. g., by smuggling. But justice demands more. Taxes on products diminish consumption by increasing price; diminished consumption checks production; a check in production checks consumption; and so still further checks production; and so on by action and reaction, men are prevented from meeting one another's wants. This in itself tends to impoverish the laborer, a tendency which is intensified by the monopoly of land, which low taxes on land values encourage.

## He Falls to See.

PHILADELPHIA.—In reply to my letter in the issue of Feb. 18, you give as an example three mines, and claim that the rent of the first will be raised by closing the second. I concede that your position is correct. If both second and third mines are closed, the rent of the first mine will be raised. But if the second mine is closed, the rent of the first mine will be lowered. For the increase of rent which would result to the owners of the first class does not benefit them unless they also hold first class opportunities, which is not generally the case.

Presuming, therefore, that you refer to existing conditions where opportunities of the first as well as the second class are held by different owners acting for their individual interests, I fail to see why the owners of the second class would "lock up" their opportunities if they could rent them. For the increase of rent which would result to the owners of the first class does not benefit them unless they also hold first class opportunities, which is not generally the case.

You may also fail to see why owners of vacant lots in cities lock them up; but they do lock them up all the same. You said it was an unfounded assumption that the private ownership of land produces a speculative rent line lower than the actual rent line, and I replied as follows:

Let us suppose three gold mines; the first of which will with a given amount of labor yield \$10, the second \$8 and the third \$6. If only the first is appropriated its rent will not exceed \$2, for nobody will work them for less than \$8 when he can make \$8 in the second mine. But if the second mine be appropriated and locked up, the rent of the first mine will be \$4 instead of \$2, for the most that labor can then make will be of the product of the third mine, which is only \$6. Now it is the system of private land ownership that permits the locking up of the second mine, and as you said, the rent line is lowered, the fact that the second mine is locked up lowers the rent line so as to raise rent from one-fifth to two-fifths of the p. duct. In this case the normal rent line leaves four-fifths to labor while the speculative rent line leaves to it but three-fifths.

You now say you do not understand why the owners of the second class would lock up their opportunities if they could rent them. They might not in the strict sense of the term "lock up." But there is a "lock up" in effect. The illustration presupposes an unchanged demand for gold and an unchanged supply of labor. An increased demand for the one or supply of the other would tend to lower the normal rent line. Now, as these are unchanged, both the first and second mines would be only partly worked. Suppose that the demand were \$100, the whole of it being produced from the first mine before the second was appropriated. Then \$20 would go to rent and \$80 to wages. But when the second mine is appropriated half of the product, say, comes from each mine. Then of the \$50 from the best mine \$20 would be rent and \$30 wages, and of the \$30 from the second mine \$10 would be rent and \$20 wages, showing a total of \$30 rent as against \$20 before, and \$70 wages as against \$80 before. There is a fall in wages due to the speculative rent line, for if it were not for private ownership of land, which encourages speculation, the second mine would not be appropriated until the first was worked to its full capacity.

The same result may be and is produced by an actual "lock up," mines, farming land, city lots and so forth being held out of use for the purpose of making a profit by selling rather than by renting.

## In the Coal Regions.

EASTON, Pa.—(1) A buys a lot for \$1,000, all the money he has. B buys alongside and builds a house worth \$30,000. A not being obliged to pay as much tax as B.

(2) The coal monopolies sell lots to their

miners, but only to a certain depth. How would the tax affect the monopoly?

## H. L. BACHMAN.

(1) The tax would be the same in each case. It is right that it should be. If A does not want to build or cannot afford to build, he has no right to prevent others from building. And if B lives up the building trade by erecting a \$30,000 house, there is no reason why he should be punished for it by a heavy tax.

A appropriates the same amount of common values that B does; why should B pay a higher tax because he benefits the community by putting his land values to use while A plays dog in the manger with his?

If the As were all compelled to let go of the land they are keeping out of use, work would be so plentiful and wages so high that \$1,000 would be much easier earned, and when earned could be put into an untaxed house instead of being sunk in the purchase of a piece of the earth on which to put a taxed house.

(2) If there was a value below the surface the coal monopolies would be taxed for it. As a fact building sites in the coal regions are of very little value compared with the value of mining rights; therefore miners would pay little or no tax for the land on which they live, but coal companies would pay a heavy tax for their right to mine beneath the miners' cottages.

## The Chief Benefit.

(1) I have long seen the fallacy of our protective laws, still I am unable to discover any relation between the land value tax and free trade. I had thought that a tax on land values to the full rental value thereof would be full restitution to the people of rights which they have been robbed from time immemorial; that the adoption of this system would do away forever with poverty, would do away with the necessity of one man being dependent on another for employment, that it would, in short, strike away the very foundation upon which the protected capitalist bases his profit. It is because of its immense sweep in this and many other directions that the land question becomes so soul stirring and fills its disciples with such enthusiastic endeavors. If this be so, can the mixing it up with any other question do otherwise than belittle it? Let us pride ourselves on having but one principle, and that so broad as to include all others, and so plain and simple that a child may understand it.

(2) Your correspondents seem all to agree that this system should be brought about by state action. If each state were to collect its own land value tax, will your system then have reached its ultimatum in justice? Are the land values of the several states so nearly proportionate to the inhabitants of those states as to work absolute justice by each state absorbing its own? For instance, the population of New York is eight times that of Colorado. Are not her land values more than eight times as great? And if so, did not we of Colorado do as much as you of New York to create those excessive values? Render unto Caesar, etc.

(3) This, however, is based upon the assumption that there are excessive land values in the greater commercial and manufacturing states. Is such the case or not?

(4) Have you any means of knowing approximately the land values of the several states, or some of them? And if so, will you kindly publish a list? RODNEY FOX.

(1) No good can come from mixing up the single tax question with other questions. But free trade is not another question. It is one of the steps that must precede the single tax. We cannot have the single tax and the protective tariff tax, nor can we have the single tax until we get rid of the protective tariff tax. The single tax principle cannot enter into national legislation except through the free trade controversy, for the bulk of national taxation is collected through custom houses, and it would be just as absurd to try to influence congress in favor of the single tax without asking it to abolish the protective tariff as it would be to ask a state legislature to adopt the single tax by abolishing the protective tariff. The single tax question and the free trade question are distinct and, and only as, the states are distinct from the nation.

I think your confusion is attributable, like that of most people who write or talk as you do, to your idea that the chief object of the single tax is to collect land values into a common fund for common use. That is not its chief object nor will that be its chief benefit. Ideal exactness in the collection of this fund can never probably be accomplished. But individual freedom can be accomplished, and that is the great desideratum. If you and I do equal work with equal results, it makes little real difference whether or not you get somewhat more than I; but it makes a vast difference whether or not you are able to command me on pain of starvation. If the single tax were imposed to the extent of ninety per cent of land values some owners would amply earn the other ten per cent in collecting rent while to others the ten per cent would be more than their work was worth. But that would harm no one, because no one would be dependent. Every one would be free. But to get to this point the abolition of the tariff is just as necessary a step as the abolition of taxes on personal property or the abolition of taxes on improvements. Each of these taxes hampers trade and consequently burdens industry, and it is as they are removed, that the burden grows lighter and the end of our journey is nearer.

In state affairs the easiest point of attack at present is taxes on personal property. When they are abolished we have made a long stride in the direction of the single tax. In national affairs the only prominent point of attack is the tariff, and when that is abolished we have also made a long stride in the direction of the single tax. To refuse to aid in the abolition of either of these taxes because it is not all we desire is like a man refusing to take off his overcoat because it is not his overcoat but his undershirt that he wants to remove.

We do "pride ourselves on having but one principle;" it is the principle that all taxation should be abolished save that on land values. And that principle is "so broad as to include all others." It includes the abolition of the tariff, the abolition of personal property taxation; and the abolition of taxes on improvements, and though it does not in terms include the principle that land should be taxed to its full value, it does in effect, for the

benefits of the single tax once realized by the people they would never stop demanding public improvements until the only fund from which they recognized the right to draw—land values—was exhausted. Moreover this principle is "so plain and simple that a child may understand it." It must be a very young child who does not understand that the simplest way to eat an apple is one mouthful at a time.

(2) In abstract justice, possibly not; but individual freedom will be secured. Abstract justice might require that all the land values of the world should be used for common purposes; but substantial justice does not. Substantial justice is attained when all barriers to traffic are removed, and all unused land is open to the first comer. This question, like your first, is dictated by your idea that the single tax is only a scheme to return to the people what landlords take from them in rent. This is its least important object.

(3) I do not know, but I am inclined to think that there is a tendency in all communities to an equilibrium between communal needs and land values.

(4) Nothing but Mr. Croasdale's calculations in his tract on "Sailors' Snug Harbor."

## Chas. English Farms.

St. Louis, Mo.—A writer in the January number of the London Quarterly Review states that many farms in England are lying idle and that the owners are willing to rent these farms for sums which would pay but a small part on the value of the improvements. He makes mention of a spot not far from London from which can be seen nine unoccupied farms. Will THE STANDARD kindly help at least two of its readers to account for these facts, if facts they be?

J. H. D. I cannot verify the statement; but there is no reason to doubt it. England's farming is being done in other countries, and it is not at all strange that her farm lands should, as farm lands, depreciate in value. If it be true that farms can be rented in England or elsewhere for a small percentage on the value of the improvements, it is because farming in that location does not pay. It is essentially the same thing that happened in Oil City when that place was in its decline. Houses could be rented for less than their value, because nobody wanted houses there. If more than the ordinary rate of interest on capital, and more than the ordinary rate of wages could be made by working those English farms they would not go begging for tenants at a small percentage on the value of the improvements. They could not be had except for a premium.

Land in England is in a transition state. Agriculture is declining because the people of England can raise wheat easier by digging coal or weaving carpets than by plowing and sowing. Consequently agricultural land is declining in value. But as it goes out of use for agriculture, it comes into use for something else. Particular agricultural land may lie out of use for a long time, and for that reason be at a low value for a long time; but that is because it is not immediately adaptable to changed conditions. Other agricultural land, however, is so adaptable, and immediately acquires greater value than ever before.

The true test of the rise or fall in land values is not whether the value of particular land has risen or fallen, but whether land values generally have risen or fallen. If the London Quarterly Review really wishes to make a point let it show that the average land value of all England—mines, towns and cities included—has fallen. When it can show that to the extent to which it claims to show it respecting the farms it mentions it will be offering life portraits of Macaulay's New Zealand as premiums to keep up its circulation.

## An Agricultural Minister.

I have no doubt but the next decade will witness a great change in favor of the poor as against the rich, but I haven't the least idea that it will come in the line you are at present working. Having lived on a farm for years, and being brought into close contact with agricultural people all my ministerial life, I am satisfied that your single tax theory if it applied would ruin the agricultural interests in every state in the Union, and to the army of unemployed at the present would be added the agricultural laborers of the land.

The problem to be solved is a difficult one and the highest wisdom of the nation will be necessary for its solution. I don't know what opportunity you have had for acquaintance with a farmer's life, but it seems to me that a year of the life of the farmer would lead you and Rev. Mr. Pentecost to see the impracticability of your theory.

A. You appear to have made a genuine discovery. High taxation has always been looked upon as very injurious to the farmer, and now you come along with the assurance that a method of taxation which would reduce the farmers' taxes, and in many instances abolish them entirely, "would ruin the agricultural interests in every state in the Union." And you speak by the book, too, for you "have lived on a farm for years," and have been "brought into close contact with agricultural people" all your ministerial life! I confess, speaking for myself, that it is discouraging, after having thought and written and spoken for years under the impression that taxation is destructive to agricultural interests, to be told authoritatively that taxation is really what the farmers need to save them from ruin. Are you sure you are right? At any rate will you not think it over again? And to be certain that there is no mistake, will you not ask some of the farmers of your acquaintance for their opinion?

Of course you know that farmers pay taxes, and very high taxes, on nearly everything they buy when they go to the store. These taxes we propose to abolish so that farmers may purchase goods for the bare cost of production and exchange. To what extent will this ruin agricultural interests? Will it injure them at all? Don't answer hastily, but think it over, and if you are in doubt inquire among your neighbors.

You know, also, that farmers pay taxes on their houses, fences, out buildings, cattle, machinery, money in bank (when they have any), and on whatever value they have added to their farms by drainage, clearing and so forth. These taxes, too, we would abolish. In what way will that be injurious to agricultural interests? It may be that taxes on the

goods they buy are a good thing for farmers, because such taxes promote economical habits. I do not say these taxes are a good thing, but they may be. They may make farmers wear calico instead of silk and use molasses rather than sugar, and otherwise abstain from the vanities and superfluities of life; but conceding all that as to the taxes the farmer pays at the store, how can taxes on his improvements be a good thing for the farmer? I don't know, and if you do I wish you would tell me, for I am always glad to make a note of curious information. Then there are poll taxes and dog taxes and things like that which we would abolish. I can understand that farmers might experience a mournful sense of loneliness, as when an old and faithful dog dies, were these taxes abolished, but really I do not see how it would bring ruin upon agricultural interests.

But probably it is not the abolition of taxes at all that gives you concern about the farmer, but the tax on land values which it is proposed to substitute for all other taxes. Ah! Well, let us see.

You understand, of course, that it is not land, but land values, that we propose to tax. That is important to begin with. Now, as a farmer and a friend of farmers, you must also know that there are very few farms of which the land is worth more than a quarter or a third of the whole of the farmer's property. Then, you see, that at the worst we propose to tax the farmer on a basis of only about a quarter or a third of the values on which he is now taxed. Oh, yes, perhaps you will explain under your breath, but the single tax is to be so increased that it will take the whole annual value of the land, which is much more than present taxes amount to. Is it, though? Is it as much, considering that he pays taxes whenever he goes to the store as well as when he goes to the tax office? I doubt it. I am sure the real value of his land is not so much. Owing to light taxes on land values a great deal of land is put to poor use or no use at all, though it is appropriated. If nothing but land values were taxed, this land would come into market and reduce land values generally. And as land values fell the farmers' taxes would fall. I have no doubt that a large proportion of our agricultural land has only a nominal value, and that if taxes were put on land values alone, buildings and other improvements and personal property being exempt, great numbers of our farmers, instead of being ruined and turned into tramps, would find themselves untaxed either by the store keeper or the assessor.

I have replied to your criticism only with reference to its bearing on the selfish interest of a class of the community. It is a class that is hard pressed and whose selfish interests are entitled to consideration as are those of every other plundered class. But there is a loftier element in the problem. You are evidently a minister. What have you, as such, to say of the system that undertakes to deny to any man the right so obviously natural to a place on the earth? Do you believe the being whose minister you profess to be, intended that the earth should belong to a few and that all others should be dependent on them for the privilege of living on it? Do you believe he intended that some of his creatures should make a living by selling privileges to the others to use the earth? If you do, what kind of a being, and I intend no irreverence, is this whom you represent?

You have taken enough interest in this subject to read THE STANDARD and to send your views to it; now will you not pursue your inquiries a little further by reading "Progress and Poverty" so as to understand the subject of land value taxation in all its bearings? LUCAS F. POST.

What Would This Family Gain by Emigrating to the Tariff Protected United States? The commissioner of labor, Washington, D. C., in his first annual report gives the following particulars of the mode of life of a spinner at Halifax, England.

Condition.—Family numbers three—parents and child. Occupy tenement house consisting of parlor and one bedroom, each about 15 by 12 feet, one small bedroom and one kitchen or wash room, parlor is also used for dining room, has window opening on street, is carpeted and looks clean and comfortable. The grate is adapted for baking bread and simple cooking, saving expense of extra fires. Father reads and writes and is generally intelligent. Wife was formerly weaver, but does not work now. She has a brother in the army, and sister emigrated to New Zealand. Family are saving; have small account in savings bank. The father belongs to a social and reading club. On Saturdays work starts at 1 p. m.; afternoon spent at football, cricket or other outdoor sport. Family dress well, look contented and cheerful.

Diet.—Breakfast: Tea or coffee, bread and butter, sometimes bacon or eggs. Dinner: Piece of beef or chop, bread, butter and potatoes, sometimes other vegetables and cheese, and several times a week pudding. Supper: Bread and butter, tea or coffee, occasionally dried fruit.

Earnings of family, \$411.32.  
Cost of living—  
Rent ..... \$15.76  
Heating ..... 4.30  
Meat ..... 43.80  
Coffee and tea ..... 14.56  
Alcohol ..... 11.20  
Vegetables ..... 25.53  
Fruit ..... 7.20  
Groceries ..... 149.65  
Clothing ..... 57.60  
Fuel, water, light ..... 5.51  
Sundry ..... 12.25  
Incidentals ..... 11.96  
Expenditures ..... \$411.32  
Earnings ..... 411.32  
Deduct ..... 91

## Common Sense.

Cedar Rapids News Era. If the legislature, instead of fooling away their time over such absurd proposals as the Hutchinson bill to increase taxes on capital and labor, would turn their attention to some measures for relieving labor and capital of taxation, then they would be doing the state some real service. Any attempt to increase the taxes on capital only so much more increases the burdens of labor, for capital is like a man on horseback and labor is like the horse. You may put more weight on the man and thus inconvenience him somewhat but that only makes the horse's load heavier. It is utterly futile to try (as the Hutchinson bill proposes) to help the farmer or laboring man or business man by taxing mortgages, notes, money or capital in any of its forms, for capital is only the name of the tools that these men must use, and if we tax their tools we but check the production of wealth and make it harder for them to earn a living. There is only one kind of tax that falls justly and fairly on all classes of people and that is a tax on land values.

## TAXING LONDON GROUND RENTS.

J. Morrison Davidson, in London Star.

The paragraph in the Star's magnificent "Confession of Faith" dealing with the subject of ground rent taxation has already been the fruitful mother of much wholesome controversy.

The Star's correspondence columns have teemed with letters on the question. The Pall Mall Gazette, ever among the earliest of journalistic birds to pick up the worm of democratic progress, has at great length "interviewed" Lord Hobhouse, who, it says, "is probably the most distinguished authority whose opinion could be obtained on the subject." At three influential public meetings, including that held at St. James's hall to denounce the unprincipled conduct of the metropolitan board of works, ground rents and their all but complete immunity from taxation have been seriously and more or less intelligently discussed.

Among the oratorical disputants "we have had such diverse personalities as Mr. R. T. Reid, Q. C., M. P., Mr. J. T. Dodd, the Rev. T. M. Thorne, vicar of Holy Trinity, the bishop of Emmaus, coadjutor to Cardinal Manning, and last, not least, Mr. William Saunders, late M. P. for East Hull, who was the first to bring this all important subject under the consideration of Parliament.

To those who have studied the land question, and like myself, hold that the whole plant is the common God-given inheritance of mankind, the mere ground rent phase of the subject is without difficulty or complexity of any kind.

For what are the broad facts of the case? The annual value of the land or site of London is estimated at £16,728,830 (capitalized value £418,220,750), while the annual value of the buildings amounts only to £13,271,170 (capitalized value £212,338,720).

On the £418,220,750 less than half a million (£250,000) is levied in taxation; whereas the £212,338,720 are taxed seven million (£7,000,000). But for the operation of the national income tax the extractors of ground rents would positively escape taxation of any kind. As it is they do not contribute a single brass farthing to the rates which are squeezing the very life blood out of the people, and by the "people" I mean all those who, unlike the idle rent mongers, are honestly striving to earn their own livelihoods by useful toil of brain or hand.

In his lecture at the Holborn radical club, where Mr. Reid, Q. C., presided, Mr. Dodd mentioned three facts which cast a lurid light on the whole question. First, the workers as a whole spend one-third of their poor earnings on rent. Secondly, the rates in poverty-stricken St. Luke's are 3d. in the pound, whereas in the region of Dives, St. George's, Hanover square, they are only 3s. 11d. and coming down. Thirdly, in St. George's, Bloomsbury, the death rate is 15 per 1,000; in Shelton street, Drury lane area, the mortality is 53½ per 1,000.

These are all correlated evils, which it is amply within the power of wise and bold statesmanship to eradicate. The Saturday Review may mock at the Star's laudable ambition to "enable the charwoman to put two pieces of sugar in her cup of tea instead of one," but before we democrats are done with the Review and his tribe, I make bold to prophesy that the charwoman shall not merely have two lumps of sugar to her tea, but ten if she wants them. For her benefit, and that of all those who both toil and spin, it has been resolved, by a macedonian phalanx of the best heads and hearts in Great Britain and the United States, that the incessant robbery of the poor by the rich, of the toilers by idlers, shall cease and determine, and the first batch of depredators to be dealt with is unquestionably the ground landlords.

In London, as has been seen, industry or the products of industry (houses) are depressed by a mulet of £7,000,000 per annum. That is a colossal sum, and the people of the world mean entirely to lift, because we know it signifies overcrowding, squalor, disease and vice and shame unmentionable. Mr. Bright once promised us a "free breakfast table." Will he or any of his liberal unionist set now help us to a free roof tree by taking all rates and taxes off the houses and placing them on the ground rents and values.

These, as has been said, amount in the metropolis to £16,728,830, and of that vast sum the Westminster, Portlands, Bedford, and other urban land monopolists, great and small, have no claim on economic equity to a single penny. The presence of the people of London alone gives value to the site of London. Sweep them away and the "prairie value" that would remain would be the merest bagatelle. The people as a whole created these land values, and to them in future, in their corporate capacity, must rent be paid, not to the extent merely of £7,000,000, or any fractional part of the whole itself.

The aforesaid £16,728,830 are the fund out of which the Star's charwoman is to get her two pieces of sugar and many other good things besides. The people of London demand free light, free heat, free water, free transit by train and rail, free education, free libraries, free medicine, free sepulture, etc., and they mean to have them. They know the source from which these things can be rightfully provided, and to that source they are instinctively turning with ever increasing hope and resolution.

The elder Mirabeau is said to have declared that Quaesnay's proposition: "All taxation should be abolished save a single tax (Pimpt unique) upon the net produce or rent of land," is "equal in utility to the invention of writing or the substitution of money for barter," and, if he did say so, he said well. "The profit (produce) of the land," he was told in holy writ, "is for all." "The earth he hath given to the sons of men"—to all the sons and not to a few pampered favorites called "dukes," "earls," and "noble lords" because they are privileged by laws of their own making to rob our charwoman of her second lump of sugar. I confess I read the remarks attributed to Lord Hobhouse by the Pall Mall Gazette interviewer with astonishment. His lordship is made to talk about the "owners" of land and "reversionary interests" in a style which would indicate that he uses juridical nomenclature in a sense unknown to English lawyers.

There are, legally, no owners of land in England. Even his grace of Westminster can only hold an estate in land, which the grantor, the crown or state, can resume whenever it is deemed for the benefit of the realm. That resumption should take place.

"Sometimes the property," said, or did not say, his lordship, "is let and re-let and sub-let, until there are as many as six or seven persons having reversionary interests in it between the occupier and the original freeholder," and about these singular reversionary interests Lord Hobhouse is deeply exercised. But the re-letting and sub-letting fraternity can surely have no better claim to consideration than "the original freeholder" from whom they derive their title to share in the blunder of the community; and of the utter iniquity (inequity) of the freeholders' position I will undertake in a subsequent paper to prove a demonstration to the satisfaction of every candid mind among the 200,000 subscribers to the Star. The existence of Lord Hobhouse's novel reversionary interest of being an argument against doing justice to our charwoman is the reverse. It merely proves that

where the carrion is there the vultures will be gathered together.

"Remember (ah! my lord) how many persons there are in all ranks of life who have sunk the savings of their lifetime in such property, relying upon its safety as an investment and looking forward to a bonus falling in sooner or later." Yea, a bonus squeezed out of the sweat and blood and tears of the living, to circulate multitude, who have had no advantage and whose father and grandfather generations grow up on heaven seemingly in vain. "Thou shalt not steal" is indeed a commandment of universal obligation; but, in a society like ours, based on the theft by the few of God's good gifts to all men alive, it should always be incutted in the form: *Thou shalt not be stolen from.*

## STRAWES WHICH SHOW THE WIND.

There can remain no doubt that some of the western states will revolt against the high tariff which they have so long and so erringly supported. The fall in the Liverpool price of what was the cotton cloth, No. 20, has upheld the value of farm products. The Herald has printed many interviews with leading farmers of Illinois, Iowa and Minnesota, and each succeeding conversation discovers the spread of disaffection.—[Chicago Herald.

As soon as the eyes of the landlords are open to the fact that the "fallacious Birmingham are in a great measure attributable to the exorbitant rents extorted from their tenants, we may expect better times; but until rents have been reduced to something like reasonable figures, failures will continue to crop out, the signs of "F. Rents" will be placarded on the door of almost every other business house in the city.—[Birmingham, Ala., Chronicle.

The time when the convention is to be held is of the first importance in starting the campaign proper, and the change in the date may be taken as indicating that the nominations and the platform will be made with a regard for the principles on which the canvass is to be conducted rather than with reference to what the popular opposition may do. The supporters of the Cleveland administration can afford to be bold and outspoken and the first in the field.—[Boston Post.

When railway managers admit that in regulating the amount of coal to be mined neither the consumers nor the miners are considered; when it is known that coal which costs the company \$1.50 a ton at Schuylkill Haven is sold to the consumer at \$3 or \$3.50 in Philadelphia, it becomes apparent that there is something radically wrong. Whether it is in the coal, or in the competition of the ready is another matter, but the public will profit by a thorough ventilation of the facts.—[Pittsburg Commercial Gazette.

The workers—the vast majority of this nation—have asked that congress take the first step to free them from the curse of monopoly. They have petitioned congress to do so. Many politicians stood around on platforms previous to the last elections, saying with all their voices: "Just let us what you want, beloved workmen, and we'll give it to you much quicker than you could get it any other way." congressional windfalls, we want the postal telegraph; and we are about to spot every mother's son who votes against it.—[Cincinnati Union Labor Age.

The Massachusetts bureau of labor statistics, without troubling itself with the question how its figures affect the favorite capitalist argument, presents to the legislature a report which sheds no little light upon the subject. From this report we learn that there are \$16,470 wage earners who average 1.23 months of unemployment during the year. The average period of idleness during the year is 4.11 months. That is to say, a little more than 70 per cent of the labor of Massachusetts finds steady employment all the year round, while nearly 30 per cent of it is unemployed for an average of four months in the year.—[Brooklyn Citizen.

The New York Times examines the policy of non-taxing personal property as advised by Mayor Hewitt. That subject has been considered on divers occasions in this city, and the opinion has been expressed that the second with those of New York's mayor, that it is wise to put the whole tax of commercial communities on real estate. Seventeen years ago a New York commission, appointed to revise tax laws, recommended the exemption of personal property without avail. Mayor Hewitt has been reinforced by a report from the Maryland tax commission, in which Professor Ely of Johns Hopkins university shows the futility of trying to collect an equitable tax from personal property.—[Boston Transcript.

Mexico is about to borrow \$50,000,000 from Berlin bankers. Mexico is one of the richest countries in the world, both in soil and in the so-called precious metals. If Dias, who is called a great statesman, and who is calling upon Berlin for capital, take some of the exhaustless resources of the Aztec hills he would soon be master of fifty times fifty millions in capital, and his people would be free from the tax of the bond holders. The blindness of this sort of policy is obvious. It is only equaled by our own. With mountains lined with solid silver we gave the whole thing away to a few monopolists and are now buying it back by the pound and storing it up in treasure chests, while the people are impoverished in misery every year on an enormous debt.—[Cincinnati United Labor Age.

Professor Stuart touched very happily in his Shoreditch speech on the grievances from which Londoners suffer. The four million of untaxed ground rents, which he referred to, represent a great unmet fund for the happiness of the people. Now they mean so many palaces, houses, servants, yachts, pictures, so much wine, so many comforts and delights reserved for the enjoyment of men who are toiled and sweated and overworked. They might mean so much light and warmth, so much cheap food, so many cheerful and decent houses, so many art galleries, so many museums, so many theaters, libraries, so much relief and amusement for the poorest, so much less prostitution, and so much less crime. Think of London—miserable, neglected, impoverished, oppressed London—dowered, like a bride, with this magnificent treasure!—London Star.

Russia wants to borrow money, and money writers are ready only to pay for it. The Financial Examiner, in estimating the situation, pronounces against the Russian loan, as the taxation "already amounts to fully \$2.50 per capita per annum, which is a heavier burden," says the writer, "than is borne by the people of any civilized government in the world." This statement may exclude America, owing to its protective tariff, which is, perhaps, held to be barbarous; but if America be permitted to enter the lists, it is to be seen that Russia is a more liberal and generous thing being used. On a pair of woolen blankets, worth \$10, he pays \$6.13 of tax. A tax of \$2.50 per capita is a bagatelle contrasted with the average burden the American inhabitant bears.—[Chicago Herald.

It is the duty of the general government in all elections for congress or president to protect, at every cost, the voter and the ballot-box. It is the duty of every state to reduce to a minimum the opportunities for fraud upon the citizen or the improper influencing of his choice. It is a general and local scandal that the expenses of the candidate have grown beyond the means of the poor and honest man. No system can be right or safe under which the treasuries of the opposing parties must be filled with sums so vast that they equal the great accumulations of prosperous corporations. The ballots should be printed by the state and distributed at the public cost, under conditions which would enable the most ignorant voter to select his ticket without help, and deposit it with no one knowing its contents but himself. Then, as the republic grows in power and population, its safety and perpetuity will be assured by the ever increasing millions of free men with more majestic and impressive force express their will.—[Chauncey Depew's Union League speech, Chicago.



shows that the increase of \$30,550,784 in the real estate assessment over that of the

high priced land. Taking all the facts together it can be safely assumed that, whatever the increase here and there in the valuation of unimproved property, the increased assessment in the city fell short of the actual value of the new buildings erected, and a comparison of the figures of

on the tract of sixteen acres formerly known as "the Shoemaker's field," and extending eastward from Broadway half a block beyond William street and southerly from Ann street to Maiden lane. The new building of the Mutual life insurance company is situated on this tract and it is one of the few buildings that exceed in value the land on which they are built. While Wall street was the northern boundary of New York city, the shoemakers, who then tanned their own leather, were driven out into the country to do their tanning, and these sixteen acres were given to five of them for a tan yard. In 1696 the lands were divided into five parts, one of which became the property of John Harberdineck, "merchant and cordwainer." This property was bequeathed by Harberdineck to

The whole area included within the city limits of New York is 26,500 acres, of which 14,000 acres are on Manhattan island, and 3,905 of these lie south of Forty-second street. The 21 acres of the Randall farm constitute therefore the one hundred and eighty-sixth part of the area below Forty-second street. As this part is worth \$6,000,000, the bare land below Forty-second street is worth 186 times \$6,000,000, or \$1,116,000,000. The assessment shows that about forty per cent of the total value of real estate lies above Forty-second street, which would indicate that the value of all bare land in the city is about \$1,860,000,000. This shows that, taking the city as a whole, the bare land is actually worth more than the present assessed value of land and buildings, and a

Over exaggeration. The ground rents alone, over and above taxes, must be at least \$78,120,000 at current rates, and the hire of houses in addition would easily bring the total paid by New York tenants up to \$100,000,000 a year. A reduction of one-fourth in this would amount to \$25,000,000 annual saving, a sum but about \$10,000,000 short of the total estimated expense of conducting the city government during the year 1888.

Of course, practical experience might fall short of a result so wonderful, but there can be no question that the tendency would be toward the multiplication of houses and cheaper rents. The suggestion that the increased taxes on land would cause a reduction in its selling price, and a corresponding increase in the tax rate, in

The jail at Thomsville was not near large enough until a new plan of punishment was adopted. The colored roughs committed crimes for the purpose of getting into prison, and in that way obtaining food and shelter, and at the same time "doin' nuffin." Not so now. The town council met and adopted the resolution that prisoners should be put to work. It is now the "chain gang" came into existence. "You will see a lot of colored men repairing the roads and doing a great deal of other public works on the highway. They wear a striped uniform. The two ends of each chain are fastened to a collar, and the ends of each arm are fastened to a collar, and together by iron chains to prevent the action of swinging but yet afford him sufficient freedom to move about and make himself comfortable. The collar is a metal one. It is a novel sight for a stranger to meet a bunch of these gaags on the road, and the clank of the locked iron links has a strange and weird sound. To their credit be it said, the men are not so much in disgrace, and the jail at Thomsville prison is now crowded with negro work and making of him a public slave have had good effect. Such a plan is of course a very good one, and it might be adopted with a degree of success in the populated districts of northern states. Tramps invade Thomsville a wide berth. If one of the negroes innocently wanders that way he is driven back and forth, or join the chain gang and work for thirty days.

100

erty was bequeathed by Harberdinck to







## THINKING IT OUT.

**Bolton Smith Analyzes the Arguments for and Against a Nomination—The Tariff Question in the Rear of the Land Question.**

Muskrat, Tenn., February 20.—I have followed the controversy between the two wings of our party with growing interest, and I must confess, with changing opinion. Immediately after our defeat—for such it was compared with what we confidently expected—I felt that our course was plain; that we should place presidential candidates in the field. This had been my opinion before the election and it remained my opinion immediately thereafter, simply because no other view had presented itself to my mind, and Mr. Cleveland's message had not been written, it must be remembered. And so, when Messrs. Crossland and Post opposed presidential nominations on grounds of policy, I inwardly exclaimed: "What have we to do with policy? I confess that I was troubled when Mr. George did not take a firm stand in opposition to these gentlemen, though I never thought him a backslider, because I still bore in mind how radically I had once differed from him on the land question and how completely he had won me to his views. Having decided to read both sides and to reserve judgment, I soon found that the opposing presidential nominations were the only ones who argued, the other side confining itself to the declaration that we must stick to principle," without once proving that their course was more agreeable to principle than the one insisted upon by their opponents; while their failure to answer the arguments urged by the latter touching the inexpediency of making presidential nominations seemed a confession of their soundness.

In the meantime, the growth of our local land and labor club had gained some useful experience of an eminently practical and convincing nature. I, who have been an ardent free trader for years, found myself apologizing for protection on the ground that "after all, free trade would do no permanent good," refraining from answering the arguments of our protectionist members as vigorously as I could have done and "suggesting" when I longed to speak positively, and tell for fear of offending the club. I was making a sacrifice for principle and yet there came to me none of that feeling of inward satisfaction which such a sacrifice should bring. On the contrary, I felt like a whipped cur, and why should I not feel so? Had I not attempted to set party above conviction and so descended to the arts of the "practical politician"? Had I not given proof of that party spirit, which in the members of the old parties is considered a virtue, but which in the new parties is considered a crime? I had done so, and I had, for all practical purposes, lied. I did and do care. Next to the restoration of the land to the people, free trade both as an end and as a means, seems the most noble cause in which one can do battle. To deny this was surely not to follow principle.

Whether a stream shall obey the law that governs it by flowing to the ocean through or around an obstruction, is a question of force and resistance, of mechanics, or, if you will, of policy; but while carrying out that policy which surrounding conditions led it to adopt, the stream would not, for one moment, disobey the law for it ever flows downward.

Our object is neither to hold conventions, to nominate candidates, to conduct elections, to secure prominence, nor even to have a grateful word some day say, "See what I have done for this land." I have done for it and for mankind? Not these things are all very pleasant, but the mother purpose of our party was the dissemination of the truth that the land of every country belongs to the people, and to secure the incorporation of this truth in the laws of the land. How this may be done is a question neither of principle, nor yet of policy, in the odious sense of the word. It is a question of force and resistance, of the right mechanics—a question of human nature.

A great deal has been said as to what we should do, a matter most proper to be considered in its place, only that place is second. The first question is: "What can we do?" and it is within the territory mapped out by the answer to the latter question that the true answer to the former should be sought and will be found. If men felt that the approaching tariff contest were an opportunity and especially if we had any guarantee that they would continue in this humor until after the election, then protectionists and free trade members of our party might well agree to take no part in it, and by running presidential candidates we should poll our full vote, whatever that may be, and so obtain consideration of our principles to a certain degree. But even now we can do no more than to make a declaration of our principles. To me such declaration would indicate that their hearts were wiser than their heads.

This above all—to think own self true; And it must follow, as the night the day, Thou canst not then be false to any man.

If men will but perform each duty as it is presented to them, and trust to God for the rest, will they not be obeying the highest principle and the truest policy? Is not this the moral of the above quotation, approved by all who read it?

Let us not forget that we are not the only men in these United States who are pure in purpose. There are many pure men in this dear land of ours thousands of men and women whose souls turn upward in fervent prayer for right guidance, and who would give their very heart's blood to serve God and their fellow men, could they but see the right road and feel sure they were doing his will. The many movements, of which prohibition and charitable organizations may be considered types, bear witness to this fact. Yet such movements are not enough to arouse and engage the trust and soundest of these noble men and women, who, born crusaders as they are, still search for a crusade worthy of the effort. The coming contest, if conducted on a plane high enough, is sure to attract the attention and enlist the support of this class as no movement in this nation has done for a quarter of a century.

Beside the fact that any appeal to principle clears the moral and political atmosphere, and gives the way for true reform, the tariff contest is par excellence the door through which we can best introduce the land question as a practical subject of consideration to the entire nation. The tariff question simply involves a discussion of the effect of indirect national taxation on the distribution of wealth, and more particularly on wages, and is sure to lead beyond its present and apparent destination. Thus the anti-tariff law enactment does not result in free land no more proves that this agitation will not so result, than the fact that caravans perish from thirst proves that there is no water to be had beneath deserts. Notwithstanding the fact that England was far from having universal suffrage at that time, will any believer in the single tax dare affirm that the publication of

"Progress and Poverty" ten years before would not have materially altered the scope of the movement?

Let us go into this movement as individuals following our own opinions. Let us see to it that the battle is fought on the plane of an appeal to justice and to right. And if we do our full duty among our temporary comrades shall we not, when the struggle is over, carry with us the soul of both parties? Mr. Wilder will ever be whispering to his comrades that the tariff raises ultimately nothing but mining royalties, stampage, etc., while our noble priest, McGlynn, will remind free traders that their reform, however excellent in its way, will, in the long run, but raise the rentals of agricultural land and of seaport towns. Will not such a course be better than independent action, which to earnest men in the older parties will seem but an evidence of that unfeeling indifference to the actual needs and woes of the present of which reformers are so often accused—so often guilty? Will such an introduction gain us converts? And how would our free traders feel if President Cleveland should be defeated through their inactivity? And how would the election of Blaine or Sherman advance our cause? These are a few contingencies it were well to ponder.

The winds of thought blow, the currents of opinion move, destroying, retarding, advancing. We can no more alter them than we can recall yesterday or hasten to-morrow. But by rendering to ourselves an account of their force and direction we may ride the currents and use the winds to fill our sails. Thus we may prove skillful mariners in any gale, for our bark is indeed freighted with much of the world's hope. BOLTON SMITH.

## DRIVING BUSINESS AWAY.

**What the Building Trades in Paterson are Demanding—Driving Business Away and Why it is Possible.**

PATERSON, N. J.—Last season the masons' union of this city demanded and obtained a nine hour work day with ten hours pay. This season they demanded in addition that eight hours shall constitute a day on Saturday and that they shall receive ten hours pay for it. Not to be too far behind, the carpenters' union demand this season nine hours for every day but Saturday, which shall have but eight, and ten hours pay for every day including Saturday. This means of course a demand for an increase in wages equal to seven hours each week or a raise all around of something more than eleven and one-half per cent.

In view of these facts many prospective builders have decided to wait awhile before building, in the confident expectation that wages will come down again. There are barrels full of suggestions in this for any one who will take the trouble to tap them.

First, by this waiting the demand for labor will be checked. Second, the checking of demand will produce a surplus of labor. Third, a surplus of labor will bring wages down. And all the labor combinations under the sun can't put them up again until the demand revives.

This is the situation. It is as old as private ownership in land, and will be the same until the single tax draws the teeth and nails of that great monopoly, and prevents it from denying to labor the right to produce.

There are many here who declare that the unions will kill business by their exorbitant demands, and they are right. But the business of Paterson will be transferred to places where workmen are contented with "fair" wages for a "fair" day's work; who say that the prospective building boom will be knocked flat by an increase of eleven and one-half per cent in wages. And the facts in the case will undoubtedly lead force to their opinions, just as the fact that wages are better here than in the old world gives force to the argument for a protective tariff. These talkers remind one of the savage chief who made a tour of the world and was struck by the fact that civilization is marked by plug hats and suspenders. The more civilized a people were, he noticed, the more plug hats and suspenders were worn, and vice versa; so reasoning as to those who maintain that a protective tariff makes high wages, and a combination for higher wages will kill business in a place, he bought a hip load of plug hats and suspenders, and sent them home in order that his people also might be civilized.

Because the natural opportunities have been better in this than in the old country, wages have been better here than there. Yet, since we have gloried in taxing ourselves for the benefit of those who own these opportunities, they have been lost sight of and the tax is credited with the better wages which naturally follow better chances of work. At the expense of good times here, values are first to appreciate. Land owners demand a return from fifteen to one hundred per cent, and as much more as men can possibly give, and keep enough to do business with. In case of a boom they will demand more than business can afford to give, and the result is that business falls flat and moves on to do the same thing over again in the next place. Now, at the prospect of good times, labor naturally wants a share of it, but by the time workmen are prepared to make a demand, land owners have so reduced the margin of business that a demand for twelve per cent more wages becomes a serious matter, and business is checked because it cannot satisfy both land owner and worker. Either the worker is sacrificed for the land owner, or, in case the workers are well enough organized to resist immediate sacrifice, business "moves on" and every one is punished. The people who lay the blame on labor unions lose sight entirely of the enormous advance in land values, and attribute the disaster to the much smaller demand for labor.

As a matter of fact, the unions are themselves at fault in allowing this state of things to continue. If they put in half as much time seeking to make work steady as they do in making spasmodic efforts to increase wages, it would soon come to an end. The light is so plainly between the land owners and the workers that one must be unwilling to look not to see it. But as the savage thought plug hats and suspenders made civilization, and the protectionist thinks high taxes make high wages, so very probably many will continue to think that a demand for more wages will spoil business. Meanwhile the workers will try to get more wages without disturbing land owners and will continue to get less.

E. W. NELLES.

## Gathering Strength in Glasgow.

GLASGOW, Scotland.—It is pleasant to see that the movement here, notwithstanding the opposition of ignorance, indifference and self interest, is gathering strength year by year. The land question is now, like Aaron's rod, absorbing all minor questions. The Glasgow town council, composed as it is of middle class men, more intent in the pursuit of self than on the study of social questions concerning the good of the people, is now obliged to discuss the incidence of taxation and how ground values would be affected thereby. It is true, the result of the last discussion was so far ludicrous to a degree, because the nearly blind were trying to lead the totally blind, or, what is more difficult, those determined not to see. Both property owners and occupiers have expressed their grievances as they understand them under the present system, so both classes are at work searching for a remedy.

JAMES M. CHERNIE.

## CHARITY AND ALMS.

ELIZABETH, N. J.—Charity is love to the neighbor. Alms giving, the relieving of the neighbors' necessities, would seem to be its most practical application; that application at least which, because of the sacrifice of self required in the alms giver, most accords with Christian ethics. This is probably the reason why the two words have acquired a synonymous meaning.

Modern thought on this subject has been colored by the philosophy of later English writers, which applies to man the conclusions reached as to the law of progress in the animal kingdom; that in the struggle for existence the strongest, the best fitted to the environment, survive and stamp their strength by heredity upon succeeding generations. From this view it would seem that any efforts to sustain those who in the struggle for existence have been unable to keep up with their neighbors, are in opposition to the natural law of progress. The weak are continued to propagate their kind while the strength of the strong is sapped and their efficiency lowered. This philosophy predicates man as a product of nature, his mental and spiritual qualities and powers being derived from nature through his physical organization by evolution. Attempts have been made to carry the operation of the law into the human or social environment which man exclusively enjoys. But here it fails because antagonistic to a spiritual law by virtue of which the mental, moral and spiritual attributes which sustain man as a social being are not coincident with those which sustain and improve him in the animal kingdom. It is evident from this higher standpoint that the best animal qualities do not produce the best men for the social environment. Jesus, Gautama, Socrates, Plato will continue to impart influences to the development of mankind after that of John L. Sullivan is lost, and after Jay Gould, with his self-sustaining, fox-like cunning, has ceased to be known and his millions are dissipated. The qualities which would be best in the animal kingdom, therefore, for the survival of the fittest in a struggle for existence, would not be those best worth preserving in man in view of his higher destiny, and aid to those least able to sustain themselves physically may be necessary to conserve the highest and most useful qualities of mankind.

God is the great almoner of the universe. Did he not continually impart his life to us we would have no existence. And we compensate him not at all. We are free to spend the life he gives us in the manner of our choice, to the extent of denying the almoner and the cultivation of the false pride of belief that we can and do live apart from him, and earn by our own efforts the good which we receive. And God's method of curing the ills which result from our way of receiving his bounty, is not to cut off the supplies, to close himself to us because of our misuse of his gifts, but to give to us still more largely; to seek us out and excite in us that compassion for which we are so deficient. He imitates him in conferring benefits upon our fellows, and so become ourselves consciously and gratefully recipients of his life, to the end that we shall be entirely saved from our evils and infirmities.

The doctrine of charity and alms has been taught by all religions worthy of the name. Jesus taught it, exemplified it and enjoined it upon his disciples, and our Christianity has always been truly measured, and, to a large extent, recognized, by the extent to which we have practiced this virtue in our lives. The Christian church has also taught, enjoined, and, in a measure, practiced the virtue. With all its exteriority, its impure mingling of truth and error by alliances with mythologies and idolatries, it has preserved for transmission to a more receptive age to be fully realized on earth, these essential truths: The doctrine of our fatherhood in one creator, our brotherhood in a common divine sonship and our spiritual existence sustained continually by reception of the divine life; and these rules of life: Love to God and our brother man as leading to the realization of the true order of the descent of the divine through our spiritual into our external forms and the coming of heaven upon earth.

In the order and life of human society, charity and alms seem to be not only potent but indispensable. The abnegation of self and devotion of powers by one to another are the promise and the goal of marriage. They are the rule of life in the family; the weak and helpless children are dependent for every thing pertaining to the natural state and for the development and cultivation of their mental powers upon the love and self sacrifice of their parents. Thus it is in the family relation that we find the type of heavenly association in which the ruling principle is not egoistic but altruistic. Parents are not made man and proud by their sacrifice of themselves to their children, but by the love enlarged in heart and made more loving to humanity. Children, receiving everything from their parents at the time when their characters are most plastic, are not thereby cultivated into a selfish manhood of indolence and servility; they are taught by the example of self-sacrifice the highest duties of life and stimulated to reciprocate, to occupy themselves with the noble position of being the almoners of God's love to the world.

In all our social relations with our fellows we are, consciously or unconsciously, mutually dependent upon each other, and the further we advance in knowledge and power over our material conditions the more dependent upon each other we become. Whether we will it or not, we cannot be independent of each other; consciously or unconsciously we must accept another's giving. In association is power, and this strength is proportionate to the giving by each. Separation into weakness is in proportion to the selfishness which prompts us to look ourselves and ourselves and refuse to give and receive, to bestow and partake.

If we look at the subject from the standpoint of justice, how evident it seems to be that those who profit by the maladjustment of social relations to obtain benefits at the expense of others should make restitution as they can by personally giving to those who have suffered for their greed. It is to Count Tolstoi and Henry George claim, that for a man to be a weight on another's back and not get off him, but only to ease his steps by pouring a few drops of oil into his boots, is the height of inconsistency. But the inconsistency is not in the little charity done, but in the not doing the greater charity of relieving him of his load. Pending instruction in the method by which those under the load may be fully relieved, men must be enlightened and their conscience awakened. Will we enlighten and awaken them the sooner by inducing them to close their soup houses, their wood splitting shops, their alms houses, their hospitals and orphan asylums; by inducing men to stop giving to beggars and cease to seek out the poor and needy to supply their wants? On the contrary, progress will be according to the increase and not the decrease of charity; for to be in a state of charity is to be receptive of the divine, the only real power there is to heal our diseases, whether they be social, moral or physical. It is well to show a greater charity, a better way; those will see the greater who have

practiced the lesser charity; those who do not practice the lesser will not do the greater, for "charity begins at home"; that is in the first thing we hands find to do, and it grows by its exercise.

To the view that by receiving charity or alms men are made indolent and willing to live without efforts of their own upon the labor of others, it may be said farther that if man is created with appetencies to be satisfied by the application of his labor to the resources of nature, which labor is irksome and he inclines to avoid, he is also created with powers the exercise of which in satisfying those appetencies is pleasurable; that idleness is not happiness, and that if all our physical wants were satisfied without labor on our part, we would still seek, in some way, gratification by the exercise of our powers. An ideal state of society, based upon man's nature, is not inconceivable in which the motive would be changed from that by which each one works to satisfy his own desires to that in which he would work to satisfy the desires of others, and in which in satisfying his wants by accepting the products of the labor of others he would be giving them happiness. Even under existing conditions of production in this world, if the labor of the human family were equitably shared, its products equitably distributed and waste abolished, less necessary work would fall to the lot of each than he would take pleasure in doing, especially so if he was cultivated to labor in the field for which his gifts fitted him. In truth, unless this state of society is in the nature of man possible, it is useless to pray for the coming of the kingdom of heaven on earth, for delight in living for others and not for self is the kingdom of heaven.

"The quality of mercy is not strained; It droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven Upon the place beneath; it is twice blessed; It blest him that gives, and him that takes: 'Tis mightiest in the mightiest; it becomes The throned monarch better than his crown. His scepter shows the force of temporal power,

The attribute to awe and majesty, Wherein doth sit the dread and fear of kings; But mercy is above this scepter'd sway; It is enthroned in the hearts of kings; It is an attribute to God himself; And earthly power doth then show likest God's, When mercy seasons justice."

BENJAMIN URNER.

## ANTI-POVERTY IN BOSTON.

**A Big Meeting on Washington's Birthday—Speeches by Professor Hamilton Garland and Dr. McGlynn.**

BOSTON, Mass.—The anti-poverty society celebrated Washington's birthday by a public meeting at Tremont temple. The hall was completely filled, and the audience included a large representation from the various labor organizations of Boston.

The first speaker was Professor Hamilton Garland of Boston university, who was introduced by the president of the society, Mr. J. R. Roche. Professor Garland spoke in brief as follows: "There are two great forces in social progress always at war—innovation and conservatism. The present state of affairs is always the resultant of these two forces. The rich and great institutions are mainly conservative, and the innovator is often a martyr. The great innovator eighteen centuries ago wore a crown of thorns, and this explains why Henry George is vilified and Dr. McGlynn cast out. (Cheers.) The error to reform, and to this great reform, in particular, are the ignorant, those who are satisfied with the present order of things; the great institutions and their paid workers, and last, those who are reforming, but are moving so slowly that the friction between them and the new movement amounts to opposition."

Dr. McGlynn was then introduced and received with enthusiastic cheering and waving of handkerchiefs. He thanked the audience for his reception and spoke of his diffidence, which would restrain him from speaking in public, in spite of a long experience, if he did not feel a duty compelling him. He said: "It has been brought to your minds that I am a priest, and the implication was seemingly that I am now suffering the penalty for doing something unworthy of this office; but it is because of a continuance of the zeal with which I dedicated my young life to the service of the poor, and to the cause of the oppressed, that I am here to-day. I have been brought to my present position. It has been my lot to say strong words for the down-trodden and oppressed, and I have been impelled thereto because it is fully consonant with priestly duties. I have seen and deplored the fact that the church and the people are getting further apart, and I have tried to remedy this. I must continue to pursue my solitary path, feeling that I am doing God's will. I stand upon this platform because I believe it to be a religious platform. The movement to reform, and to this great reform, is not poverty as necessarily by the general social scheme, must it not haunt the footsteps of progress as its necessary shadow? Ask the world. It now becomes necessary to show that we are in earnest and not visionary. So far as we are from trying to interfere with God's law that it is because of our love of God and his law that we are doing as we are. The doctrine of this platform can only be logically deduced from the love of God and the love of man. If men are not equal, human life is but a brutal scramble in which the weak are trampled upon. Is the true type of society a family sitting at a well filled board, or brutes at a trough trampling others underfoot in their eagerness and wasting in their haste more than they consume? Our platform, therefore, is not quietistic and strange, and not subversive of law and order. The abolition of poverty is in the closest touch with the law of God. Labor means life, and life means labor. Life is a gift of the creator, and it is a sacred trust for which we shall be held religiously accountable. Without labor the trust cannot be fulfilled. The human family could not live if men did not labor and labor diligently. The naked man and nature have produced all things, and better still, if the man gets a fair share, he is capable of producing things hitherto unheard of. In spite of that we live in common with the brute, there is much that we have above and beyond them. It is the sublime philosophy of Christ's apostle that we rise by material things to the knowledge of God himself. 'Man does not live by bread alone.' This stamps him as tending toward all in the universe that is good and true. He alone is conscious of a moral law which teaches him that God is a father and a brother. This is natural law, and is as well known in China as in Christian Rome. When Christ came to this world, it was not so much to teach a new law, but to give a grace and sanction to the natural law. Equality and justice are the same things; and the Bible is full of their praises. If there are not great religious principles at the bottom of all this, it had better not be; it is not for the spiritual significance, then, were life vanity. It is the religion of Christ that we serve the Father by the succoring of our brethren. We love God for his own dear sake and mankind for his. All the dogmas of the church and all the sacraments to which I give the fullest allegiance are in themselves good, but it is folly to exalt them above charity, and it is an accursed thing to use them for upholding of

the wrong-doer. The whole scheme of the world is that in the Father's own good time he will call home from school to enjoyment the child who has been learning his tasks here upon earth. Labor is good, it is noble, it is holy—we do not restrict this to mere bodily work, but everything to make the world better. The artist, the architect, the orator, and (to say a word for my own shop) the preacher, if he speak the truth, is a laborer. There exists an inalienable right of man to life and to the equal enjoyment of all the providential bounties of life. The right of property comes from making, producing; in some sense we make it. The inducement to labor is that we shall be allowed to enjoy the products of our work. Anything produced by human industry is properly considered property. It is a putrid calumny to say that this platform is against the rights of property; we do not want to steal; we want to stop the stealing. We are warring against the order of things in which one cannot get a chance to labor for life, and in which men are compelled to bid against each other and not get a fair amount of the result of the labor for his reward."

Dr. McGlynn spoke for nearly two hours, and was eagerly listened to by his audience.

## From the Treasurer of the Anti-Poverty Society.

NEW YORK, Feb. 27.—Agreeably to the instructions of the executive committee—that I should publish a monthly financial statement—I inclose the treasurer's account for February up to the time when the duties of my office were usurped by an irregularly constituted committee. Since that date there have been receipts of \$3 and no disbursements made.

Balance on hand Feb. 1, 1888	\$37 24
Receipts during February	
Ticket sales at meetings	\$212 90
Collection at meetings	71 54
Less rent of Academy one Sun-day	\$175 00
Less musical services	25 00
Less advertising	20 00
Less printing tickets	13 00
Less help at Academy	10 25
	273 75
Net receipts from meetings	\$5 49
Tickets sold for miners' benefit	
Up to report to treasurer	\$322 10
Collection at miners' benefit	172 45
	494 55
Less rent of Academy	\$175 00
Less rent of Steinway hall	30 00
Less tickets and posters	30 00
Less usher, janitor, etc.	25 00
Less musical services	15 00
Less advertising	24 00
	319 00
Net receipts to treasurer from miners' benefit	\$75 55
Initiation fees	4 00
Regular subscriptions	30 00
Occasional donations	10 00
Miscellaneous (donations, etc.)	10 00
Additional receipts Miss Munier's benefit	2 00
	\$739 94
Disbursements	
Printing and stationery	\$5 00
Publishing and issuing tracts	2 75
Office rent, salaries, etc.	129 44
Rent and postage, Riverside	1 30
Paid James E. Quinn for coal miners	360 40
	500 89
Balance in Commercial Nat. Bank	\$238 47
Balance in First Nat. Bank	4 96
Balance in Savings Bank	38 09
Balance in Secretary's hands	16 42
Account miners' benefit	252 96
	739 94

E. J. SHRIVER, Treasurer.

## Competing With Pauper Labor.

We found years ago our cotton manufacturing business with England or Chinese and Japanese markets, and with success as long ago as 1879 our poor cotton bolls exported into China no less than 1,200,411 pieces of thirty yards each, or 358,882,560 yards of cotton goods in one year, and not a very good year either for the Yankee; we find the women and men working in the cotton manufacturing industry of China for six to twenty cents per day and board themselves. Yet, our manufacturers must be protected at home against the stiff labor of Europe and Asia.

In a Nutshell.  
Honesty, Australia.  
Protection is a tariff on our exports; land monopoly is a tariff on our production; and money monopoly is a tariff on our exchanges. They are simply one thing under different names, and may all be summed up as a tax on industry.

MISCELLANEOUS.  
Those who believe that the public revenues should be raised by a single and direct tax upon relative values, and who favor the holding of a National Conference, are requested to send address immediately to  
SANTOL VINCENNES, Ind.

## NEURODONTINE.

Instantaneous cure for Toothache, Headache and Neuralgia. 25 cents. Central depot, 205 E. 11th St., N. Y.

CHARLES B. SCHADNER, PHOTOGRAPHER,  
259 Third Avenue, cor. 124th Street,  
New York.

HOLLAND'S COFFEE AND DINING ROOMS,  
125 Fourth Avenue,  
Bet. 11th and 12th Sts.

JAMES BOGAN, PRINCIPAL AGENT  
For James Boag & Co. 21 and 23 BOWERY,  
near Prince Street.

**COOGAN BROS.**  
125 COOGAN BROS. 121  
COOGAN BROS.

CARPET AND FURNITURE DEALERS.

COR. BOWERY AND GRAND STS.

COR. BOWERY AND GRAND STS.

COR. BOWERY AND GRAND STS.

COR. BOWERY AND GRAND STS.

COR. BOWERY AND GRAND STS.

COR. BOWERY AND GRAND STS.

COR. BOWERY AND GRAND STS.

COR. BOWERY AND GRAND STS.

COR. BOWERY AND GRAND STS.

COR. BOWERY AND GRAND STS.

COR. BOWERY AND GRAND STS.

COR. BOWERY AND GRAND STS.

COR. BOWERY AND GRAND STS.

COR. BOWERY AND GRAND STS.

COR. BOWERY AND GRAND STS.

COR. BOWERY AND GRAND STS.

COR. BOWERY AND GRAND STS.

COR. BOWERY AND GRAND STS.

COR. BOWERY AND GRAND STS.

COR. BOWERY AND GRAND STS.

COR. BOWERY AND GRAND STS.

COR. BOWERY AND GRAND STS.

COR. BOWERY AND GRAND STS.